

Supervision



Training



Evaluation



Evaluation of The Forgiveness Project within Prisons

Dr Joanna R Adler and Mansoor Mir

Evaluation of The Forgiveness Project within Prisons

Final Report

• • •

The whole process of the, you know, going through the process of the forgiveness course, right. It makes you think about yourself, and the kind of person you are. And, and what you've done really, so, that's what I mean by- If I hadn't done the forgiveness course I wouldn't have looked at myself so deeply really.

• • •

• • •

If I was that person now, I probably wouldn't be here talking to ya...I'd be probably in a block. You know what I mean, I'd probably be kicking off a fuss, over minor shit. I mean, my first year in prison, it was hectic, always fighting over minor stuff. Like 'this person owes me a pack of biscuits, right I've got to go punch him up, 'cos he didn't pay me on time, I've got to go hit him, 'cos if I don't hit him it makes me look like an, like an idiot in front of everyone else and I can't have that'. You know, just, weak minded, you know what I mean. And I just, grew out of that and I was thinking, 'what the fuck was I thinking?' So yeah, definitely I'm more mature. I'm a man now, so. It's good.

• • •

Dr Joanna R Adler and Mansoor Mir
Forensic Psychological Services at Middlesex University

Department of Psychology School of Health and Education Middlesex University
The Burroughs Hendon London NW4 4BT
fps@mdx.ac.uk 020 8411 4502
www.mdx.ac.uk/fps

We are grateful to the funders of this evaluation.

THE
BROMLEY TRUST
HUMAN RIGHTS
PRISON REFORM
ENVIRONMENT


The Rayne
Foundation

• T H E • M O N U M E N T • T R U S T •

Evaluation of The Forgiveness Project within Prisons

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Acknowledgements	5
1: Background to the Project.....	6
2: Evaluation Objectives	11
3: Overview of Research Design	11
3.1: Participants	13
3.2: Materials	14
3.3: Procedure	16
4: Ethics.....	18
5: Means of Analysis	18
6: Results.....	18
6.1 Quantitative Results.....	18
6.2 Qualitative Findings: HMP&YOI Mercury and HMP Saturn	23
6.3 Retrospective Interviews: HMP Jupiter.....	52
6.4 Outlier Cases and Welfare Concerns.....	66
7: Discussion	67
7.1 Quantitative Findings	67
7.2 Qualitative Findings.....	69
7.3 Limitations.....	72
8: Conclusions and Recommendations	73
8.1 Hypothesis Testing and Conclusions	73
8.2 Recommendations	74
References:	75
Appendix 1 – Qualitative Interview Schedules.....	77
Appendix 2 – Information Sheets, Consent and Debrief Forms.....	80

Executive Summary

i Background

The Forgiveness Project (TFP) is a UK based charity that uses real stories to explore how ideas around forgiveness, reconciliation and conflict resolution can have a positive impact on people's lives. One aspect of the charity's work is a programme run within prisons, targeted at the early stages of a sentence.

TFP describe their prison programme as an intensive, group based intervention that encourages prisoners to explore concepts of forgiveness and reparation in a framework that fosters greater accountability and responsibility. Every course is co-facilitated by at least one ex-offender and a victim/survivor of serious crime. The intervention can be seen as being restorative and preparatory; those who take part in the programme will tend to be relatively early on in their sentence. TFP centres on the personal testimonies of both victims and perpetrators of crime and violence. TFP is unlike many other restorative initiatives in that it has no political or religious affiliation and TFP's prison programme is similarly secular in its approach.

TFP aims to facilitate changes in attitude and thinking styles of offenders. That is, to encourage prisoners and young offenders in finding their own pathways to change. In finding those pathways, they may draw on many different resources and insights. These could include personal, communal, spiritual or religious beliefs that they may have, whether or not they have previously seen those beliefs as relevant to their offending behaviours.

TFP run programmes via both education and psychology units. The emphasis on individual change is also intended to differentiate TFP from prison or National Offenders Management Service interventions. This person centred, facilitative but non prescriptive approach was adopted with the intention that prisoners and young offenders would be more responsive to the intervention than they may be to other, more standardised, manual based programmes.

ii Design and Participant Information

This evaluation was commissioned to build on a previous qualitative examination of the work of TFP within prisons and to provide information that would begin to evaluate its impact. The aims included consideration of the extent to which TFP is meeting its objectives and assessment of whether adequate safeguards are in place for the young offenders and adult prisoners who participate in the intervention.

We adopted a triangulated approach using quantitative and qualitative methodologies with:

1. A prospective, longitudinal sample of male young offenders and older male prisoners and matched control groups (a total of 20 research and 20 control group participants across two institutions, followed up over 3 months).
2. A sample of 7 prison staff drawn from the same two institutions.
3. A retrospective, cross-sectional sample of 4 adult, male prisoners from a third institution.

Our key hypotheses for this evaluation were:

- H1: That TFP will encourage greater awareness of victims and victim empathy.
- H2: That TFP will encourage enhanced cognitive processing and improved thinking skills.
- H3: That participants will face psycho-social challenges that result in additional needs, currently unmet. These needs include increased anxiety, challenges to self-esteem and increased negative attitudes.

iii Research Tools

For the three month, prospective follow up strand of the research, quantitative measures were implemented before, immediately after and 3 months after, research group participants completed TFP's intervention. The standardised measures are listed below.

- The Self Liking/Self Competence Scale-Revised [SL/SC]
- The State Trait Anxiety Index, 12 item version [STAI]
- The General Health Questionnaire, 28 item version [GHQ-28]
- The Post Traumatic Stress Diagnostic Scale [PDS]
- The Constructive Thinking Index in 41 item form [CTI-41]
- The Beck Dysfunctional Attitudes Scale [BDAS].
- The Crime PICS II [CPIC]
- The Prisoner Life Stress Scale [PLSS]

Additionally, semi-structured qualitative interviews were included at the 3 month point with the research group.

The control group completed the standardised measures at Times 1 and 3 by way of a quantitative comparison, but qualitative processes of change were not assessed within control participants. For additional triangulation, interviews were conducted with 7 staff (a mixture of uniformed and non-uniformed) and with 4 further adult, male prisoners from a third institution, all of whom had completed the programme at least a year prior to interview.

Qualitative analysis allowed us to consider aspects of the lived experiences of the prisoners and young offenders interviewed. The depth of analysis provided practical insight that facilitated an examination of how prisoners demonstrated key psychosocial constructs such as empathy, in the details of their speech, and in their reflections on self change in relation to others.

iv Findings

Our findings indicate partial support for each hypothesis:

H1: That TFP will encourage greater awareness of victims and victim empathy.

When assessing this hypothesis on the standardised scale (the Victim Hurt Denial sub-scale of CPIC), there was a clear "floor effect". In other words, even before the intervention, there was little evidence that prisoners explicitly denied they had caused harm to victims. This may well have reflected prisoners' prior participation in programmes such as "Becoming Victim Aware" and other work being conducted at the institutions considered. In contrast, when conducting in depth, more probing qualitative interviews, we found clear indications that there had been improvements in attitudes towards victims. The qualitative research component thus enabled us to better understand the nature of prisoners' attitudes towards

victims, and furthers our concept of victim empathy beyond the starting points of whether or not they deny hurt caused to victims of crime.

H2: That TFP will encourage enhanced cognitive processing and improved thinking skills.

This hypothesis was designed to test possible processes at play if TFP did seem to have an impact. Firstly, we can say that the quantitative data did indicate that TFP encourages attitude change in areas most likely to have an impact on desistance from crime. Those who had attended TFP workshops showed improvements in scores on the General Attitudes to Offending, Anticipation of Future Offending and Evaluation of Offending as Worthwhile subscales of CPIC. However, the standardised scales selected to measure attitude change and cognitive functioning in general, non criminogenic ways, showed no enhanced cognitive processing or improved thinking skills. So, although TFP seemed to have the potential to reduce reoffending, the measures selected did not give us a route to understand the processes by which such changes occur.

Here again, the qualitative interviews helped provide a little more information. Prisoners spoke of being more mature, feeling calmer, being less hasty, even of surprising themselves by how much less strident their actions had become since engaging with TFP. Similarly, officers and other staff identified prisoners who had been more pro-social and again, calmer than previously.

H3: That participants will face psycho-social challenges that result in additional needs, currently unmet.

Some participants did display anxiety, have health related problems and show evidence of outside problems and trauma. However, these did not appear to be related to TFP and in most cases were pre-existing. Some of the scores on trauma scales and anxiety scales were certainly concerning, and there were clear indications of at least one prisoner with suicidal thoughts. Care was taken to find out more in each case of concern, and we found that on-going health problems or family difficulties outside the prison were more at play than anything else. We therefore conclude that there are significant matters of prisoner well-being to be considered but these are generalised matters for prison management and control and could not have been said to be caused by or worsened by engagement with TFP. Indeed, we had repeated evidence that where prisoners were in distress, both TFP and the institutions concerned were working very hard and efficiently to share information and enhance safer, healthier custody.

v Summary of Recommendations:

Before considering our recommendations, we think it worth highlighting the impact that TFP could be having on recidivism. Recidivism is not something that can be effectively measured whilst prisoners are still incarcerated. However, there are tools routinely used to inform risk assessments and decisions about licence or progression within prisons. One tool that has been widely adopted within HM Prison Service, is the CPIC. Given the low numbers of prisoners and young offenders being followed up, we had not felt it likely that there would be sufficient variance within the cohort to show change before and after the intervention. However, the impact of TFP seems to have been powerful enough that the changes were statistically significant. This is a very positive outcome of the evaluation and indicates that a larger scale evaluation of impact, post release is warranted. Although the data are complex,

the most encouraging finding is that there is almost unanimous praise for TFP's work and its impact, both from prisoners and staff. They all highlight the powerful speakers, the sensitive facilitators and the importance of group and individual ownership of processes of change.

TFP is repeatedly identified as being different, as allowing prisoners and staff to step out of the normal roles required within incarceration. It fundamentally appears as a humanising, empowering intervention that provoked very strong support in evaluation participants. Our key recommendations are summarised below.

1. TFP needs to be better understood by the wider establishments within which it is operating.
2. The team should consider implementing screening measures to promote management/referral of prisoners with increased vulnerabilities and to help with future systematic review of its operations.
3. The TFP team need to consider whether they wish to seek to run the intervention as an accredited programme.

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank the young offenders, prisoners and staff at all levels who participated in this research and who helped to facilitate our fieldwork. In particular, we would thank those at HMP High Down and HMP Guys Marsh. We are also very grateful to the third institution that was involved in this evaluation but which has a policy of not being identified in research. In order to help maintain individual participants' confidentiality, we have used pseudonyms for all three institutions within the rest of this report.

Funding

This research was commissioned by The Forgiveness Project and it was funded by The Bromley Trust, The Monument Trust and The Rayne Foundation.

1: Background to the Project¹

When an offender is sentenced, the aims of the court are largely determined by the Criminal Justice Act, 2003 and are to punish, deter, rehabilitate, protect the public and allow reparation. Different aspects of these aims may be prioritised within any one sentence but it would be fair to say that the purpose of sentencing is multi-faceted. Predictably, the aims of the prison service when offenders are incarcerated, reflect some of those of the CJA, 2003. Prisons are tasked with protecting the public, maintaining a safe and secure environment and preparing prisoners for release back to the community, hopefully less likely to re-offend than they otherwise would have been. HM Prison Service objectives are currently:

To protect the public and provide what commissioners want to purchase by:

- *Holding prisoners securely*
- *Reducing the risk of prisoners re-offending*
- *Providing safe and well-ordered establishments in which we treat prisoners humanely, decently and lawfully.²*

Interventions such as that run by The Forgiveness Project (TFP) can aid in meeting all three of these aims, but it is probably best considered in terms of reduction in recidivism rates. As such a very brief, look at the debate as to “What Works” to reduce reoffending may be useful here.

The phrase “What Works?” was coined by Martinson (1974) in a paper that he published, partly with the intention of arguing against the over-use of imprisonment. He set up the premise of “what works?” in rehabilitating prisoners largely to knock it down and conclude that nothing works within prisons so alternatives would need to be found. The paper was an early publication from a large scale project that came out the following year with more nuanced discussion of the findings (Lipton, Martinson and Wilks, 1975). The team’s conclusions can be summarised as being that: rehabilitation programmes weren’t working; or, that they may be working but it was unclear whether their methodology had properly evaluated them; or, that the programmes weren’t being given the opportunities to work as they were not funded or implemented properly. More recently, there has been a less negative tone that has been reinforced by legislation and has, in part resulted in increasing prevalence of prison sentences that have a clear rehabilitative as well as deterrent intention.

If the stated purposes of punishment and imprisonment are complex, then how much more complicated it becomes to implement those intentions when prisoners are themselves varied people who can arrive at prison with many unmet health, education and welfare needs as well as their convictions. Prisoners often have complex histories of trauma, abuse, substance misuse and victimisation. They may well suffer from mental illness or have learning difficulties. Their personal histories and on-going challenges are frequently hidden

¹ During the analysis stage of this project, the Forgiveness Project’s programme in prisons rebranded and that intervention is now known as **RESTORE**. However, as all the participants in this research knew the intervention as the Forgiveness Project (TFP), and referred to it as such, we have retained the use of **TFP** throughout this document.

² HM Prison Service Vision and Principles: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/about/hmps> (accessed 27th February, 2012)

from others or they may not even acknowledge them to themselves. Burnett (2010) writes of the “plight” of the prisoner who returns to society and highlights that the period immediately following release is one of particular challenge where offenders are more likely to over-dose (accidentally or deliberately), to complete suicide, breach licence or to re-offend and be re-incarcerated. Indeed, rapid re-imprisonment has long been acknowledged, as the “revolving door” problem-- when people seem to move from one short term sentence into another. This rapid cycle of incarceration, release and re-incarceration would point to the importance of intervening to prevent reoffending with offenders during very short sentences, particularly for first time sentence servers. Yet, most adult, prisons based programmes are offered to long term sentence servers, where concerns over the repeat “life course persistent” offenders (e.g. Moffitt, 2003) have predominated.

Where interventions are offered, they are most likely to be around a model of Risk, Needs and Responsivity or RNR (Andrews and Bonta, 2006). The popularity and prevalence of this approach is demonstrated by the Canadian government’s public safety web-pages which also provide a neat definition, shown below:

Risk principle: Match the level of service to the offender's risk to re-offend.

Need principle: Assess criminogenic needs and target them in treatment.

Responsivity principle: Maximize the offender's ability to learn from a rehabilitative intervention by providing cognitive behavioural treatment and tailoring the intervention to the learning style, motivation, abilities and strengths of the offender. (Public Safety Canada, 2007³).

The above emphasis placed on risk assessment and mitigation of such risks has been the same in HM Prison Service, along with the routine use of programmes/interventions underpinned by Cognitive Behavioural principles. The use of such interventions is, in part regulated via an internal accreditation system run by HM Prison Service and there are multiple programmes that have been accredited for use with offenders. There are also substantial numbers of programmes that are unaccredited but still offered to prisoners, usually through third party providers. TFP’s prison intervention is one such programme. These programmes too, can be accredited and are increasingly able to satisfy the criteria required by NOMS. These criteria are based on the premise that:

clearly defined and structured programmes using particularly, but not exclusively, cognitive-behavioural techniques can significantly reduce re-offending. The meta-analytic reviews do not suggest that there is any single, outstanding approach that is, by itself, guaranteed to work as a means of reducing re-offending. (MoJ, 2012 p7).

This statement summarises the view that interventions broadly based on RNR can be more effective than no intervention at all, something borne out in several meta-analyses (e.g. Andrews and Bonta, 2010 or Lösel and Schmucker, 2005). However, authors such as Porporino (2010) have pointed out that it is not totally clear *how* the programmes work and we do not know whether they work for all groups of offenders, raising questions about their

³ http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/res/cor/rep/risk_need_200706-eng.aspx (Accessed March, 2012)

equity in implementation. Additionally, although they show improved rates of desistance from crime (between 10-30%, Lösel, 2010), they are far from showing total desistance. Although a zero recidivism rate is Utopian, this does not mean that alternatives to RNR should not be considered. Additionally, RNR has been criticised for not finding ways to encourage engagement with programmes and for high attrition rates. One way of putting it has been that RNR is necessary but not sufficient (Ward and Maruna, 2007).

The most prevalent alternative to RNR that has been offered is a strengths reinforcing model, rather than a trigger avoidance one. Authors such as Maruna (2001) have started to have some policy influence in promoting their stance that prisoners need to concentrate on change through their strengths rather than avoiding risks. In 2007, Ward and Maruna developed much of their work around what had come to be known as the Good Lives Model and it is this model that has led to the expansion of accreditation criteria within NOMS. The starting points of the good lives model are that:

...offenders, like the rest of us, actively seek to satisfy their life values through whatever means available to them. The GLM's dual attention to an offender's internal values and life priorities and external factors such as resources and opportunities give it practical utility in desistance-oriented interventions (Ward, nd)

Within this model, criminal behaviour is seen as arising from maladaptive means being adopted by offenders to satisfy life goals that may themselves be legitimate and interventions under the GLM are seen as providing the offender with the means to:

add to an individual's repertoire of personal functioning, rather than an activity that simply removes a problem, or is devoted to managing problems, as if a lifetime of restricting one's activity is the only way to avoid offending (ibid)

In trying to implement the GLM, within probation or prisons, the first step will be to work with each offender to identify her or his targets, assessing how s/he would envisage a good life. Deeper understanding of specific goals or "primary goods" would involve prioritising them and working out, with the offender, what snags, or blockages there might be before s/he can attain those primary goods. Intervention would then be tailored to address both the criminogenic (offending related) needs and the good lives needs. Governments have mainly followed the RNR approach but there is growing acknowledgement that the focus on resilience through avoidance rather than through building strengths, brings limitations.

Strengths based approaches, such as the GLM, fit well into post-release programmes of resettlement as they allow space to consider "social exchange" and "individual value" (Burnett, 2010) and so are popular within probation. Another approach gaining currency is that of Therapeutic Jurisprudence (TJ). TJ is the "study of the role of the law as a therapeutic agent" (Wexler, 1999). Within this theory, the law is seen as a social process that exerts influence over people's behaviours with consequences for individual and societal well-being, both psychological and emotional. An example of TJ in practice would be the increasing use of motivational interviewing within probation services. The idea here is that the probation officer does not just find out what has brought an offender to their present state, nor where they would like to be at the end of their sentence, but it helps them to actively engage within the rehabilitative programme that is being proposed. How best to motivate them,

will depend on how ready they are to change and tools used in this context, have been adapted from the clinical setting (e.g. see Birgden, 2004).

Each of these broad approaches could be drawn on, or even be seen as directly influencing sentencing and imprisonment over the last decade but there is also an overarching theory that warrants consideration here, that of restorative justice. The principles of restorative justice have been contested but something close to a consensus view was articulated by Hudson and Galaway in 1996. They outline the three elements that they consider fundamental to restorative justice. These are:

1. That crime does harm to victims, communities, and offenders and that it arises out of conflict.
2. That criminal justice processes should seek to repair that harm through reconciliation.
3. That victims, offenders, their families and communities should all be actively involved in repairing the harm and resolving conflict brought about through crime.

These principles have had far reaching appeal with initiatives in England and Wales dating back over the past four decades and, in part, resulting in the reparative component of the Criminal Justice Act, 2003.

TFP can be set within a restorative justice frame but there are also clear elements of therapeutic jurisprudence within the intervention offered. In the past 8 years, TFP has developed from an initial exhibition of photographs and narratives of forgiveness to being a provider of outreach programmes and “in-reach” services to prisons. They have continued to collate, document and share people’s stories and have designed a programme for prisons that encourages prisoners to explore concepts of forgiveness in a framework that should foster greater accountability and responsibility. It encourages critical evaluation and reflection through narratives of trauma, responses to that trauma and the potential roles of forgiveness. It is a group based intervention that encourages sharing of experiences within a framework influenced by restorative justice principles.

The workshop format centres around one, three day long intervention, which itself follows on from an introductory half-day session using a speaker’s personal story and drawing on film and other formats to explain the nature of the project’s aims within prisons. At the introductory session (normally run prior to the 3-day workshop), TFP aims to make it clear that the course is not about ‘teaching’ forgiveness, but rather is about discussing the limits and possibilities of forgiveness as a way of opening up a conversation about choices and consequences. The structure of the intervention can slightly vary at times. For example, at one of the institutions visited in the course of this study, the half-day group induction was replaced by more informal one to one contact on the wings. At the same institution, the main workshop was run over just two days.

Within the main workshop, narratives are presented by victims (through live presentations) and facilitators through films, audio stories and stories to be read during workshops. The facilitators come from a variety of backgrounds, bringing with them a mix of skills and expertise; there is always at least one former prisoner working in this role who will also present his or her life history. Narratives are constructed by the prisoner/young offender participants themselves as they are encouraged to share experiences, construct life

maps, keep “cell books” and, in some circumstances, create films. The project aims to provide a powerful intervention to challenge prisoners and aid in their eventual reintegration to society.

As indicated above, group work within prisons and more mainstream society, has been the focus of previous research attention and there are models of good practice that have been developed within HM Prison Service (for example, Prison Service Order Number 4350). Similarly, where therapeutic interventions take place, there have been materials developed for practitioners as guidance and greater regulation has been instituted to protect client groups (for example statutory regulation of psychologists was brought in during 2009). As an external provider of a narrative intervention, TFP comes somewhere in between providing accredited group work and therapeutic programmes.

TFP is not accredited by the prison service but is mindful of the advice provided to accredited programmes by the Rehabilitation Services Group of NOMS (RSG). In particular, the *Desistance Theory Fact* sheet prepared by the RSG and Maruna (2010) provided useful guidance on what programmes should aim to facilitate and the external links they needed to foster. Areas suggested that would enhance the likelihood of effective rehabilitation include:

- Focus on relationships where offenders are fairly treated, and strong, participative engagement is encouraged.
- Ensuring that staff use language in ways that positively reinforce messages of desistance.
- Focusing on strengths, not just risks.
- Recognising milestones and acknowledging achievements towards desistance.

TFP offers something to prisoners that is not only interesting, challenging and potentially of help in moving forward through their sentence, but something that has the additional incentive of being offered by people from outside the prison. This increases the desirability for participants and has the potential to fit quite well within new commissioning structures being adopted by the Coalition Government and general principles espoused in *Breaking the Cycle* (2010) and the 2011, response to the consultation launched by that White Paper. It is worth reiterating that TFP is not offered as a therapeutic intervention however, it does draw on a number of tools from counselling, asking prisoners to produce a cell book and to create a life map and it does ask people to address issues about themselves that they may never have previously considered.

TFP aims to challenge self perception to facilitate transformative learning, possibly through fundamental shifts in participants’ world views. The intervention’s objectives are:

- To develop empathy by helping prisoners understand the impact of their actions on others.
- To improve emotional awareness and self esteem
 - which will help prisoners engage with others in ways that are respectful and worthwhile
- To develop and enhance offenders' communication skills through participation in a group.

- To open prisoners' minds to an alternative way of viewing themselves and the world, one that makes a crime-free life seem attractive.

When attending workshops to address these aims and objectives, the prisoner participants should be considered to be a potentially vulnerable client group. There is thus a need to assess further the impact of TFP in Prisons, both in terms of its objectives and the potential vulnerabilities of prisoners and young offenders. This could also help to identify future and current support needs for prisoners and young offenders and highlight capacity needs for TFP.

In beginning to address this need for evaluation, Dr Lois Edmund conducted a qualitative assessment based on the first 18 months of The Forgiveness Project's operations in prison. Dr Edmund is a clinical psychologist, working in private practice and academia in Canada. That study identified key themes raised by prisoners who had previously participated in the project focussing largely on its efficacy as a means of facilitating transformative learning and justice. The key conclusions from that study include:

- That almost all the participants should be acknowledged as both victims and perpetrators of violence.
- That transformative justice is challenging, difficult and can lead to dramatic insight.
- That transformative education is "psychologically costly to all involved".

2: Evaluation Objectives

This evaluation sought to build on the work conducted by Dr Edmund and to provide information that would begin to assess the impact of TFP in prisons. We adopted a triangulated approach to consider the extent to which TFP is meeting its objectives and safeguarding participants. Specifically:

1. To consider the immediate and short term impact of TFP on representative samples of prisoners drawn from two cohorts of prisoners/young offenders participating in the workshops over a three month period, with matched control groups.
2. To consider the longer term impact of TFP based on interviews with prisoners who have previously completed the workshops.
3. To consider the impact of the programme both on the prisoners, and on the wider prison, from alternative perspectives.

3: Overview of Research Design

To meet these objectives, we took a mixed methods approach, drawing on both quantitative and qualitative, prospective and retrospective research techniques.

In meeting Objective 1:

We implemented a range of standardised research protocols, with 10 prisoners and 10 young offenders, shortly after the introductory workshop, during the 3 day workshop and 3 months afterwards. At the third time point, the research interviews went beyond the standardised measures to include a qualitative, semi-structured protocol. We also implemented the standardised questionnaires (but not the qualitative interviews) with matched control groups at Times 1 and 3. The control groups also comprised 10 young offenders and 10 prisoners. All young offender/adult prisoner participants were male.

Please see the materials section for more detail on which scales were implemented at which times.

In meeting Objective 2:

We conducted wide ranging, retrospective, qualitative interviews with 4 offenders who have been through the TFP workshops over the past 5 and half years. These interviews considered matters such as possible use of techniques learnt at the workshop, demonstration of attitude change and different perspectives gained.

In meeting Objective 3:

We have conducted interviews with uniformed and non uniformed staff including personal officers and psychologists who have attended the workshops themselves as well as other officers and staff who work with prisoners who have participated in the workshops, but who have not themselves attended. This latter group of staff includes staff from education and chaplaincy. Within these interviews, we asked participants to assess whether the prisoners who had participated in the workshops had sought/needed additional support since the workshop and how the workshops have been received in each institution. As well as testing the potential for transformative change, participants were prompted to consider both actual and potential difficulties or harm that might have been caused by the TFP intervention.

Our key hypotheses for this investigation are:

- H1 That TFP will encourage greater awareness of victims and victim empathy.
- H2 That TFP will encourage enhanced cognitive processing and improved thinking skills.
- H3 That participants will face psycho-social challenges that result in additional needs, currently unmet.

These include:

- Increased anxiety
- Challenges to self concept/self identity/self esteem
- Increased negative attitudes.

It should be noted that this research did not involve clinical diagnoses, nor offer therapeutic interventions although they could be helpful for subsequent follow up.

Another way to conceptualise the research approach taken is in terms of an impact and process evaluation. We aimed to assess impact, or *whether* the programme was having an effect, through changes in scores on standardised scales and through changes in behaviour reported through the qualitative component of the work. Additionally, we aimed to try to understand the process, or *how* any effects occurred, again, both through quantitative, standardised measures and the qualitative components of the final interviews.

3.1: Participants

In total, 51 people participated in this research. The total numbers of participants can be broken down into: 20 Adult Male Prisoners (10 research, 10 control) from HMP Saturn; 20 Male Young Offenders (10 research, 10 control) from HMP&YOI Mercury; 7 uniformed and non uniformed staff from governor to officer grades, 4 from HMP&YOI Mercury and 3 from HMP Saturn and 4 Adult Male Prisoner participants from HMP Jupiter. All participants in this research were over 16. Participants were recruited using a mixture of opportunistic and stratified sampling. Prisoners and young offenders in HMP Saturn were identified for invitation to participate through NOMIS searches, based on who attended initial information workshops run by TFP. At HMP&YOI Mercury there was no group induction so participants were selected from those scheduled to participate in an upcoming workshop.

At HMP Saturn, the control group was, where possible, recruited from prisoners who had attended initial information workshops but who did not go on to participate in TFP sessions. Other prisoners were recruited to the control group based as far as possible on matching them to the demographic and offence characteristics of the research cohort within each institution. At HMP&YOI Mercury, the lack of a formal group induction meant that all of the control group were selected via the latter method. There were, however, additional considerations that affected the selection of control groups. In some cases, regime demands limited the prisoners who could be seen at any given time. For this reason, opportunistic, snowball sampling was employed in order to recruit three members of the control group at Saturn.

Efforts were also made at both sites to prioritise control participants with an expected release date beyond the planned final sessions of data collection (3 months on from the first tranche of data collection). In recruiting participants, attention was paid to try to ascertain a mixture of experiences including whether or not participants had previous convictions and the nature of their index offence. For security reasons, we were not allowed to keep full records of the demographic composition nor offending histories of the full sample so we have not reported that information here.

Staff were invited based on their observation of, or participation in workshops, and, or, their (working) relationship with the prisoners/offenders. Four of the staff were female and 3, male. The 4 prisoners recruited for the retrospective strand of work relating to objective 2 were recruited based on who was still serving a sentence (or had been re-imprisoned) at least one year after their completion of TFP's workshop. Selection of these last 4 potential participants was conducted with the assistance of local staff. Searches of records held by interventions staff identified nine potential participants who met the principal criteria of having completed TFP around one year ago. All of these were initially approached. Of those nine, 6 were willing to take part and were available at the times when interviews were scheduled to take place. The final four participants were selected at random from these six.

Once invited to participate in the research, all potential participants were given information relating to limited confidentiality, the research process, and other standard information in line with good, ethical practice (see Appendix 2). They were free to decline, or to withdraw during the research process itself. As an outside organisation, we expected initial participation rates to be high. However, this is a longitudinal study and we also predicted a high attrition rate as prisoners were moved through the system, or lost interest

in the research process. Our concerns about attrition rates were, unfortunately, somewhat borne out as Table 3.1.1 below indicates.

Institution	Time 1* Research	Time 1* Control	Time 2 Research	Time 2 Control	Time 3 Research	Time 3 Control	1 year later
Saturn Prisoners	10	10 {2}	9	n/a	6	4	n/a
Saturn Staff	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3	n/a	n/a
Mercury YOIs	10	10 {4}	9	n/a	4	8	n/a
Mercury Staff	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4	n/a	n/a
Jupiter Prisoners	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4 {3}
Total Offender Participants	20	20	18	n/a	8	11	4
Total Staff Participants	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	7	n/a	n/a

Table 3.1.1: Participant Information

*-{additional prisoners approached who refused}

Of the prisoners lost to the evaluation during the research process, 3 were still in the initial institution but refused to take part at the third data collection point, time 3. Fourteen further prisoners were unable to take part for a variety of reasons. The most frequent reason was being moved on to other institutions or being released before they could be interviewed. In a few cases the lack of ongoing participation was due to regime demands. As we were concerned about the low Time 3 response rate, we asked for prison service assistance in reaching prisoners who had not been released but had been moved to other institutions. With assistance from the teams at the original prisons and psychologists at the institutions to which they had been moved, four further prisoners agreed to participate at Time 3 (see procedure below). However, we have had to exclude the data from one of those four transferred prisoners. This is because he completed the form in such a way as to clearly indicate that he had not engaged with the process (ticking answers in a straight line down all pages). As his data were anomalous his responses were excluded from the analyses.

3.2: Materials

Materials used in the evaluation were finalised in consultation with the research commissioners and steering committee. Objective 1 involved both quantitative and qualitative measures implemented at up to 3 time points with adult prisoners and young offenders. We utilised standardised measures that were supplemented and complemented by qualitative interview protocols at Time 3. The standardised measures used were:

- The Self Liking/Self Competence Scale-Revised [SL/SC](Tafarodi & Swann, 2001)
- The State Trait Anxiety Index, 12 item version [STAI] (Spielberger, Gorsuch, & Lushene, 1970)
- The General Health Questionnaire, 28 item version [GHQ-28] (Goldberg & Hillier, 1979; Goldberg & Williams, 1988)
- A slightly amended version of the PTSD symptom severity checklist from the Post Traumatic Stress Diagnostic Scale [PDS] (Foa, 1995).
- The Constructive Thinking Index (Epstein & Meier, 1989) in 41 item form [CTI-41] previously validated for use with prisoners by Adler et al. (2008).
- The Beck Dysfunctional Attitudes Scale (Beck, Brown, Steer, & Weissman, 1991) also validated for use with prisoners by Adler et al. (2008), [BDAS].
- Crime PICS II [CPIC] (Frude, Honess, & Maguire, 1998)
- The Prisoner Life Stress Scale [PLSS] (Loucks, 1998)⁴

Table 3.3.1, in the sub-section below, shows which materials were implemented with which group at which time, within the longitudinal research conducted to evaluate objective 1.

Two semi-structured interview protocols were designed and implemented at Time 3 with the research and control groups of adult prisoners and young offenders. The interview protocol used with the research group of participants consisted of 10 broad areas that were supplemented with directed prompts, as necessary. This qualitative interview opened with questions designed to understand how prisoners first heard about and came to TFP; this moved into an exploration of their initial expectations of the programme. Thereafter, the interviews considered the impacts and effects of TFP for the individual participant, and of other programmes that they may have undertaken. Particular emphasis was placed on interpersonal interactions, challenges or changes in offenders' thinking styles and approaches to problem solving, including how they have dealt with difficult situations. There were questions about motivation to change, whether they had undertaken any other programmes and participants were asked to consider their likelihood of re-offending. It had initially been hoped to conduct in depth qualitative interviews with control group participants as well. However, the research was revised several times in the commissioning process and ultimately, cost restraints meant that the control group were drawn on to measure potential changes on standardised tools, but qualitative processes of change were not assessed. I.e. the last interviews with control participants were solely centred around the standardised measures.

The materials designed for objective 2, comprised a qualitative, semi-structured interview protocol. This was used to help prisoners reflect back on their experiences of TFP and to consider potential longer term effects. There were 11 broad areas considered that were similar to the prospective research questions. So, interviews opened with an assessment of what prisoners initially felt about TFP, how they felt after completing it and how they felt about it at the time of the interview, at least one year on. They were asked to consider potential changes in their behaviour and motivations and to reflect on whether TFP

⁴ Please note that the researchers will happily discuss the materials in more detail, and can provide examples of questions used within each of the standardised tools. However, we have not included them in an appendix to this report due to copyright and licencing restrictions.

had influenced any of their subsequent decisions within their sentence. They were also asked to compare TFP with other programmes that they may have taken.

For objective 3, we designed a semi structured qualitative interview protocol that was implemented to staff from the two institutions. This interview protocol consisted of 10 broad areas with subsidiary prompts used as needed. The interviews opened with assessment of the extent of staff participants' involvement with and understanding of TFP; then moved on to consider the possible impacts of TFP that they had seen within the prisoners and young offenders they knew to have been through the programme. We explicitly asked for consideration of matters such as victim empathy, possible successes and possible problems or issues raised by the programme.

3.3: Procedure

All potential participants were invited to participate, provided with full information and consent sheets in conformity with British Psychological Society, Health Professions Council, NOMS and HM Prison Service ethics and governance rules (see Appendix 2). The voluntary nature of the interviews, and rights to withdraw without penalty were stressed. At the end of each research session, participants were encouraged to ask questions; where there was more than one session with the researcher, participants were reminded of their research rights as part of each session. At the end of the sessions, participants were given additional information including how to contact the research team (also shown in Appendix 2).

For objective 1: Following consent, the research groups of prisoners and young offenders were given some of the core, standardised measures at all three times. Time 1 (T1) was implemented for baseline measurement; Time 2 (T2) for assessment of the immediate impact of the workshop against research group baseline scores; and Time 3 (T3), for slightly longer term assessment and comparison with the control group. At T3, we also conducted qualitative interviews, thus the final session was the longest. The scales chosen for all three times were those most centred on prisoner well being, including the trauma and anxiety measures. Scales that were implemented less frequently were ones that were less likely to show change or where they would only be relevant at one time. For example the Prisoner Life Stress Scale asks about events that either have or have not happened to the participant over the course of the evaluation; it was thus most relevant at T3. For the control groups, we implemented the standardised scales only, shortly after the initial information workshop at T1, then 3 months later at T3. Table 3.3.1 below shows which materials were implemented with which groups of participants at which times.

Research Measure	Time 1 Research	Time 1 Control	Time 2 Research	Time 3 Research	Time 3 Control
SL/SC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
STAI	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
GHQ-28	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
PDS	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
CTI	✓	✓		✓	✓
B-DAS	✓	✓		✓	✓
CPIC	✓	✓		✓	✓
PLSS				✓	✓
Qualitative Interviews				✓	

Table 3.3.1 Implementation points of materials used within objective 1

Objective 2:

Retrospective interviews were conducted with 4 prisoners at HMP Jupiter who were still serving their sentence but who had completed TFP at least a year before the research interviews. The procedure for recruitment and debriefing was as outlined above. Again, the forms can be seen in Appendix 2.

Objective 3:

Staff were interviewed at the 3 month point, when they were best placed to reflect on the impact on the prisoners who have attended TFP and what its wider effects may be within the institution.

Changes to Procedure for Time 3 Research follow up:

As predicted, we had significant attrition in the research groups by T3. In order to bolster the response rate at T3, a follow up exercise was conducted in an attempt to obtain data from those participants who were not seen. This was restricted to those who had moved on to other establishments, and did not include those who had been released. This would have posed practical challenges and required additional access to information restricted under Data Protection legislation, it would also have added more “noise” to the research design. Therefore, it was decided not to include data from released participants. For those still incarcerated, printed questionnaire packs were prepared, along with an additional section featuring questions adapted from the interview schedule with space left for short, written free-responses. These free responses were inevitably much briefer than the detailed interviews that had been conducted in person, but did still give participants a chance to express some of their thoughts, in their own words.

At HMP Saturn there had been a total of 15 research and control participants who were not seen at T3. Two of these were still at Saturn but were not seen due to a combination of illness and organisational limitations. Five additional participants had been released at the time that the follow up exercise was conducted (2 months after the bulk of T3 data were collected). One participant had been transferred to an establishment not on the NOMIS system and was therefore difficult to locate. For the remaining 7 possible participants, questionnaire packs and a covering letter were forwarded to their new establishments.

Four responses were sent back to the research team. One of these (from a control participant) was not included in the final data set due to perfectly uniform responses, indicating that the participant was not engaging with the questions. This contrasted with the corresponding T1 responses, where the same participant provided the expected variation in responses. The remaining responses included two research participants and one control.

A similar follow up exercise was also attempted for participants initially at HMP/YOI Mercury. Due to different local security policies regarding the release of names and NOMS numbers this was administered by staff at the prison, who passed on questionnaires on behalf of the research team. There were no responses received, suggesting that these remaining participants had been released, or had moved on to other establishments but declined to complete the questionnaire after it was sent to them.

4: Ethics

Ethical considerations included that we were asking sensitive, somewhat intrusive questions of participants and that the research may itself flag up issues of both security and well being. In particular, this research was designed in part to assess how The forgiveness Project itself may affect participants, including the possibility of trauma or raising issues that are then left without proper support. In conducting this research, we were therefore mindful of the need to ascertain any such possible impacts and our own duty not to worsen them. This research was thus vetted by the Middlesex University Psychology Department Ethics Committee and was sent to IRAS (the joint research ethics system for health, social care and criminal justice research). It was designed in compliance with both the British Psychological Society's code of conduct and the Health Professions Council ethical code. A full fieldwork risk assessment, the materials to be used, information, consent and debriefing forms were all subject to scrutiny. The ethics committee approved the project and several months thereafter, the National Offenders Management Service confirmed that they were happy for this to proceed as an evaluation of an existing intervention.

5: Means of Analysis

The qualitative interviews were analysed using principles drawn from Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (e.g. Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009). This allows people's lived experiences to be put at the centre of the analysis conducted by the researcher and is a well used qualitative research technique.

Prior to analysis, the quantitative measures were all scored, coded and recoded as necessary (e.g. taking into account items requiring the poles to be reversed). The quantitative data have been analysed to give both descriptive statistics and to test for significant differences between the times of implementation. In doing this, we aggregated data for each sample but also conducted a case by case approach to test for possible problems within individual participants. It was highlighted within our original proposal that any changes likely to be present were highly unlikely to be statistically significant and to be of relatively low power, as the numbers involved are necessarily low.

6: Results

6.1 Quantitative Results

The mean scores on all scales broken down by institution/age and whether the participant had (research) or had not (control) completed TFP are shown in Tables 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 below. Please note that comparisons *between* research and control groups were designed to be made at Time 1 (before the intervention) and Time 3 (3 months after the intervention). Time 2 comparisons were designed to be only *within* the research group, and were to look mainly for problems that could have been caused by completing the programme.

In Table 6.1.1 we have put in bold those means where the differences between the research (those who completed TFP) and the control group (those who were not on the TFP workshops) were found to be statistically significant and those which tended towards significance. In both tables 6.1.1 and 6.1.2, all asterisked means were significant at $p \leq 0.05$, those in bold without asterisks had p scores of 0.06.

Measure Implemented	Research Group			Control Group			Combined Means		
	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
T1_TotalSelfLikingCompetence	53.84	19	8.023	57.85	20	10.57	55.90	39	9.51
T2_TotalSelfLikingCompetence	57.33	18	8.25				57.33	18	8.25
T3_TotalSelfLikingCompetence	56.20	10	9.51	58.00	12	11.05	57.18	22	10.17
T1_TotalStateAnxiety	19.15	20	7.50	17.60	20	5.43	18.38	40	6.51
T2_TotalStateAnxiety	19.50	18	6.97				19.50	18	6.97
T3_TotalStateAnxiety	21.70	10	9.24	17.67	12	3.23	19.50	22	6.80
T1_TotalTraitAnxiety	24.30	20	6.89	23.00	20	5.92	23.65	40	6.37
T2_TotalTraitAnxiety	22.83	18	5.57				22.83	18	5.56
T3_TotalTraitAnxiety	24.10	10	3.28	24.17	12	5.02	24.14	22	4.22
T1_HealthTotal	18.16	19	12.22	13.90	20	10.70	15.97	39	11.52
T2_HealthTotal	17.28	18	12.01				17.28	18	12.01
T3_HealthTotal	15.30	10	14.04	14.42	12	7.53	14.82	22	10.69
T1_TotalTrauma	10.05	19	8.70	9.15	20	13.22	9.59	39	11.11
T2_TotalTrauma	9.06	18	9.84				9.06	18	9.84
T3_TotalTrauma	8.70	10	11.24	9.25	12	9.96	9.00	22	10.31
T1_TotalConstructiveThinking	145.74	19	19.09	145.26	19	23.95	145.50	38	21.36
T3_TotalConstructiveThinking	141.38	8	14.826	139.58	12	17.54	140.30	20	16.12
T1_TotalDysfunctionalAttitudes	96.45	20	13.74	96.11	19	21.67	96.28	39	17.82
T3_TotalDysfunctionalAttitudes	95.20	10	9.89	95.50	12	16.89	95.36	22	13.83
T3_TotalLifeEventsScale	1.78	9	1.21	2.46	11	2.34	2.15	20	1.90
T1_CPIC_GsubRaw	40.15	20	10.10	43.00	20	10.47	41.58	40	10.26
T1_CPIC_AsubRaw	12.15	20	4.40	13.15	20	4.99	12.65	40	4.67
T1_CPIC_VsubRaw	5.50	20	1.96	6.80	20	2.97	6.15	40	2.57
T1_CPIC_EsubRaw	11.60	20	2.91	12.80	20	3.00	12.20	40	2.98
T1_CPIC_PsubRaw	27.15	20	8.54	28.55	20	11.25	27.85	40	9.88
T3_CPIC_GsubRaw**	36.10	10	10.64	45.08	12	7.82	41.00	22	10.08
T3_CPIC_AsubRaw**	10.30	10	4.99	15.08	12	4.76	12.91	22	5.34
T3_CPIC_VsubRaw	5.90	10	3.07	4.92	12	1.73	5.36	22	2.42
T3_CPIC_EsubRaw**	10.60	10	2.22	13.08	12	2.35	11.96	22	2.57
T3_CPIC_PsubRaw	26.20	10	9.52	26.58	12	9.74	26.41	22	9.41

Table 6.1.1 Mean Scores broken down by Research and Control Groups

In table 6.1.1 (immediately above) we are considering the two institutions together, comparing those who completed TFP (research participants) with those who did not (control participants). We ran a series of ANOVA tests to compare the mean scores on each measure used between research and control group participants at the times measured. These indicated no significant differences between research and control groups on any of the measures taken except for 3 sub-scales of the CPIC. The significant differences found were all at T3 (as this was when comparisons could be made with the control group). They were on the following sub-scales: CPIC-G, the General attitude to offending: $F(1,20)=5.20$, $P \leq 0.01$, eta squared=0.21; CPIC-A, the Anticipation of reoffending: $F(1,20)=5.27$, $P \leq 0.05$, eta

squared=0.21 and CPIC-E, the Evaluation of offending as worthwhile: $F(1,20)=6.39$, $P \leq 0.05$, eta squared=0.24. There were no significant differences on the remaining two sub-scales, CPIC-V victim hurt denial and CPIC-P (perception of current life problems).

These data indicate that there were no significant differences before the programme between the research and control participants. In other words, as they were broadly similar at the outset, any differences found are likely to be attributable to the intervention. After the intervention, we can see that those who completed TFP are scoring lower on the CPIC-G, A and E sub-scales. These lower scores indicate a change in the direction sought by TFP and a move away from criminogenic attitudes. The F(isher) scores and eta squared data both indicate that for all three of these sub-scales, the effect size is robust with about 20% of the variance apparently being accounted for by the intervention.

Given that the samples reflected two different institutions and that within each institution, the population was somewhat different, we also tested to see if there were institutional/age differences within the data. We turn now to consideration of whether there were differences between the two types of offender/institution where TFP was being run. It is important to note that the scope of the study and possible choices of where TFP is being implemented meant that we cannot say whether any differences discussed below are to do with the institutions themselves or the type of prisoner (adult male cf young offender) as of necessity, these were confounded in the original design. Thus, in assessing these data, it is important to note that any differences found are not necessarily as a result of institutional or regime differences.

Table 6.1.2 below shows the mean scores broken down by the two institutions. Please note that the combined means are the same as in 6.1.1, (as in each case, it is the total data set on each scale at each time) they are shown for completeness of data reporting. As mentioned above, measures presented in bold with asterisks were significantly different at $p \leq 0.05$, those in bold with no asterisks tended towards significance.

Measures Implemented	HMP Saturn			HMP&YOI Mercury			Combined Means		
	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
T1_TotalSelfLikingCompetence	55.05	20	10.47	56.79	19	8.57	55.90	39	9.51
T2_TotalSelfLikingCompetence	55.56	9	10.51	59.11	9	5.18	57.33	18	8.25
T3_TotalSelfLikingCompetence	56.40	10	11.30	57.83	12	9.60	57.18	22	10.17
T1_TotalStateAnxiety	19.95	20	7.22	16.80	20	5.44	18.38	40	6.51
T2_TotalStateAnxiety	22.56	9	8.89	16.44	9	1.81	19.50	18	6.97
T3_TotalStateAnxiety	22.30	10	8.68	17.17	12	3.69	19.50	22	6.80
T1_TotalTraitAnxiety	22.90	20	7.43	24.40	20	5.20	23.65	40	6.37
T2_TotalTraitAnxiety	22.56	9	7.35	23.11	9	3.41	22.83	18	5.56
T3_TotalTraitAnxiety	24.40	10	3.84	23.92	12	4.68	24.14	22	4.22
T1_HealthTotal	19.35	20	13.06	12.42	19	8.59	15.97	39	11.52
T2_HealthTotal**	24.00	9	13.94	10.56	9	3.24	17.28	18	12.01
T3_HealthTotal	17.90	10	13.53	12.25	12	7.26	14.82	22	10.69
T1_TotalTrauma	13.05	19	10.99	6.30	20	10.44	9.59	39	11.11
T2_TotalTrauma**	15.44	9	10.50	2.67	9	1.87	9.06	18	9.84
T3_TotalTrauma	11.00	10	11.79	7.33	12	9.07	9.00	22	10.31
T1_TotalConstructiveThinking	143.95	20	19.77	147.22	18	23.46	145.50	38	21.36
T3_TotalConstructiveThinking	140.80	10	12.50	139.80	10	19.79	140.30	20	16.12
T1_TotalDysfunctionalAttitudes	92.16	19	16.05	100.20	20	18.91	96.28	39	17.82
T3_TotalDysfunctionalAttitudes	90.60	10	12.63	99.33	12	14.04	95.36	22	13.83
T3_TotalLifeEventsScale	2.88	8	2.30	1.67	12	1.50	2.15	20	1.90
T1_CPIC_GsubRaw	40.55	20	11.38	42.60	20	9.18	41.58	40	10.26
T1_CPIC_AsubRaw	12.80	20	4.83	12.50	20	4.63	12.65	40	4.67
T1_CPIC_VsubRaw	6.15	20	2.66	6.15	20	2.54	6.15	40	2.57
T1_CPIC_EsubRaw	11.70	20	2.98	12.70	20	2.97	12.20	40	2.98
T1_CPIC_PsubRaw	30.50	20	11.77	25.20	20	6.86	27.85	40	9.88
T3_CPIC_GsubRaw	38.80	10	11.81	42.83	12	8.46	41.00	22	10.08
T3_CPIC_AsubRaw	13.10	10	6.52	12.75	12	4.41	12.91	22	5.34
T3_CPIC_VsubRaw	5.20	10	3.30	5.50	12	1.51	5.36	22	2.42
T3_CPIC_EsubRaw	11.50	10	2.88	12.33	12	2.34	11.96	22	2.57
T3_CPIC_PsubRaw**	31.40	10	10.45	22.25	12	6.18	26.41	22	9.41

Table 6.1.2 Mean Scores broken down by institution.

We again ran ANOVA tests to explore the possible impact of institution/type of offender on the sample as a whole. Broadly speaking, the scales that tended towards statistical significance and that met the threshold for statistical significance are those most associated with difficult life events. In each case, HMP Saturn, where prisoners were older, tended to produce higher mean scores. Most simply put, the ANOVA scores indicate that prisoners are likely to have troubled lives and those who have lived longest (and potentially offended the most) are more likely to have experienced the most problems. The key findings from these ANOVA analyses indicated that:

- Prisoners in HMP Saturn have more health problems than those in HMP&YOI Mercury, from the outset: T1 Health-- $F(1,37)=3.79$, $p=0.06$, eta squared 0.09 (medium effect size, tending towards significance). Within the research groups only, (as controls were not measured immediately after the programme), this difference was more marked at time 2: T2 Health-- $F(1,16)=7.94$ $p\leq 0.05$, eta squared=0.33 (large effect size and significant difference)
- Also within the research group only, levels of anxiety are higher in Saturn at time 2 with T2 STAI State Anxiety scores being $F(1,16) 4.08$, $p=0.06$, eta squared=0.20 (large effect size but not quite over the statistical significance threshold).
- Similar findings were demonstrated on Trauma measures. T1 Trauma: $F(1,37)=3.87$, $p=0.06$, eta squared=0.09 (medium effect size, tending towards significance, but not significant); T2 Trauma: $F(1,16)=12.91$ $p\leq 0.01$, eta squared=0.45 (large effect size and statistically significant).
- The last (sub)scale to produce a significant difference was the CPIC-P scale which is concerned with perceptions of current problems. This scale indicates on-going problems for prisoners in HMP Saturn (see case analysis below) T3 CPIC-P: $F(1,20)=6.51$, $p\leq 0.05$, eta squared=0.25. It may be worth noting that at T1, the differences between the institutional means were not as marked and are not statistically significant, though are in the same direction (T1 CPIC-P: $F(1,38)=3.02$, $p\leq 0.09$, eta squared=0.07).

For all the significant findings and those that tended towards significance, additional tests were run to see if they remained significant when both independent variables (TFP intervention and institution) were put into the statistical models. These were tested using repeated measures tests of the general linear model and using ANCOVA where the effect of one variable is tested whilst the other is also put into the model as a “co-variate”. Most of the institutional effects were lost when controlling for whether or not someone had participated in the programme. The only two that remained significant were the Time 1 measure of Health and the Time 2 measure of State Anxiety.:

T1 Health	$F(1,7)=6.12$	$p\leq 0.05$	partial eta squared=0.47
T2 STAI State Anxiety	$F(1,7)=5.49$	$p\leq 0.05$	partial eta squared=0.44

This implies that some of those who took part in the programme did have elevated levels of anxiety and more problems with their health. However, as the health problems were at time 1 and the time 2 anxiety scores were only gathered for the research group, not control participants, more work is needed to properly interpret these findings. Some of that work was completed within the qualitative components to the time 3 interviews with the research group and we will therefore return to these areas later, in section 6.4.

When comparing research and control groups—to test for impact of TFP, the intervention effect remained significant, even when allowing for institution; i.e. the impact of TFP still came through on the CPICs sub-scales, 3 months after the intervention:

T3 CPIC G(eneral attitude	$F(1,19)=4.16$	$p=0.055^5$	partial eta squared=0.18
T3 CPIC A(nticipation)	$F(1,19)=5.8$	$p\leq 0.05$	partial eta squared=0.23

⁵ not quite significant

T3 CPIC E(valuation) $F(1,19)=5.4$ $p \leq 0.05$ partial eta squared=0.22

We will consider this finding more in the discussion but will note here that this is a positive outcome, indicating that TFP seems to be lowering the risk of recidivism.

6.2 Qualitative Findings

HMP&YOI Mercury and HMP Saturn

Please note that quotations are preceded by an identifier formatted thus: XYn where X is the initial of the institution, Y is either staff (S) or prisoner (P) and n is the participant number within that particular sample. The identifiers should demonstrate the breadth of responses from which the quotations have been drawn, whilst retaining confidentiality.

We open our consideration of the qualitative component of the interviews with excerpts taken from HMP Saturn and HMP&YOI Mercury, prisoners, young offenders and staff. Here, the interviews were held 3 months after completion of TFP. In section 6.3, excerpts are presented from interviews conducted at HMP Jupiter with prisoners around a year after completion of the programme. In both sub-sections we have incorporated text boxes that highlight key findings, particularly drawing the reader's attention to the lived experiences of those who participated in this project. Quotations used to illustrate these phenomenological points of interest are also used within the more general thematic analysis presented throughout these sub-sections.

Overall view of TFP: Staff

The staff we interviewed had a range of experience and depth of knowledge about TFP in prisons but was overwhelmingly positive:

SS2:...the thing that really attracts me about the Forgiveness Project is the fundamental simplicity of the message it's giving, um, you know, it's- Gets you very quickly I think, to, the very difficult issues it's asking prisoners and staff and everybody else to address. Um...the idea that pretty much everybody both needs to forgive and be forgiven, whatever their situation...I think is very powerful. And it's self-evidently true, it's one of those things that's very difficult to, it's very difficult to debunk that basic...principal. But once you apply it, it requires you to answer some incredibly challenging and complicated questions; particularly in the complicated lives that most prisoners have led.

MS4: Oh, very good. Very encouraged by it. Certainly would like to know a bit more about how it's structured, and what things are covered. So I can, be more supportive of, you know, lads who come, having done it.

SS3: Um, it's actually quite exciting. And I'm not normally someone that actually, has in the past been a believer in a lot of these programmes, but this one's good....So, I, ah, I like this because it allows them to come up with their own ideas and views and ways, which then coincidentally do really conform with what you want them to do. It's almost like they're, ah... They're, they're structuring it themselves, and it's coming out the way you want it to, you know. So...I think it's got a real chance of succeeding, succeeding with prisoners.

MS3: I really enjoyed it, erm, out of all the agencies that would come in the Forgiveness Project was probably my favourite. Erm, and it was always really well received by the lads. So I think it was always really different to anything they had done, so initially there might have been some sort of trepidation but straight away they got into what was going on. So yeah, I always viewed it very positively and it seemed to have a really positive impact.

SS1: ...there's so much to gain from that course that it's the type of course you wish that people could do voluntarily. Without having to be in prison.... This type of course could affect people in the out- In the community-...It's, it's the content of what they're talking about. In other courses you, you may get AA, something like that where they all talk about their drug misuse. They'll talk about a particular thing. Whereas with the Forgiveness, you're going, you're going a lot deeper than that...And it's, you know, you're asking a lot of tough questions on that course.... Forgiveness can do some strange things. I was only an officer sitting there and I've come away thinking myself.

Although few in number, there were some reservations expressed by staff, both in terms of prisoner suitability for TFP and in terms of how the institution itself might respond to the needs of TFP participants when they return to the wings.

SS3:... I think that everybody should go for it, unless they've got mental problems. I think that would be a difficult...Yeah, 'cos I mean, self-Prolific self-harmers, you've got to be careful, because if, er, remembering that 'daddy beat me up' is one of his triggers, that the last thing you want is him sitting in there going, "Yeah, the reason that I do commit crimes is that my dad was abusing me as a kid.". So I think, I think some you might need some, ah, liaison with the mental health nurses, anybody's who's under that, like so... But generally, I think that everybody should give it a go, and then if it's noticed that they're having a hard time on that first day, then, then that's when you take the action, before they do their life lines and opening up.

Overall view of TFP: Offenders

Prisoners were almost unanimously positive about the programme.

SP3:...I think it's a very good programme. I mean the project, forgiveness project, it's a very good project and, erm it's quite well, it's well presented, and ah, erm, I was quite surprised how, erm, how it's benefited me really. At first I think, I didn't really think there'd be much benefit... 'Cos you know, the name 'Forgiveness', I thought 'there's nobody I need to forgive. They need to forgive me'...But it's not as simple as that really.

SP1: I'm very thankful I went to the forgiveness project, and, erm, it, it, it did teach me a lot, albeit as I say, a lot of the people there had similar, had similar problems, unlike mine really in many way.

The young offenders are clear that they have taken something away from the programme and that they enjoyed it, one participant was keen to do it all over again and each could identify something that helped or resonated with them:

MP1: It was good. Everyone was participating in it, it was good... 'Cos everyone was involved, no one was, not getting involved. Everyone enjoyed it, it was a nice calm environment.....I think it helped me to realise that, you, you're not the only one going through it, there's other people out there that do. So, yeah...

SP4: It allowed you to be and express yourself and say things you would not otherwise say.

MP5:... yeah definitely. Forgiveness innit. The word 'forgiveness' was- Like if you'd have said 'forgive' I'd, I'd think 'forgiveness is a weakness', in my, in my eyes, before this Forgiveness Project. And, do you remember when we first come together and everyone's like 'if you forgive something you're a dickhead'.

However, caution should be exercised as their responses are nuanced and individual journeys are varied, often extremely challenging. MP5 continued:

MP5:... 'It's stupid'. But now I think 'forgiveness, let me forgive someone'. Not something major. If you kill, my brother or something like I said, at the start, I won't forgive you. I will seek revenge. But, forgiveness over stupid little minor things that- I don't know, er, like I said to you before, little things you can forgive and be forgiven, you don't have to hold grudges. Before, before this Forgiveness Project, I held a lot of grudges with a lot of people...But now, I don't hold grudges, you know what I mean? 'Cos you, forgive it.

Phenomenological Point of Interest: A 'safe place'

Many prisoners noted that they felt that their participation in the group facilitated a sense of belonging, building their sense of trust in being able to show vulnerability in discussing or confronting issues around the limits and possibilities of forgiveness, the implications of their choices in life and the consequences of these choices. In depth interviews revealed the extent to which the group environment was valuable to prisoners – as a contrast to their experience of the wider prison environment (and in some cases, of alternative groups).

Thus, SP4 noted positively that the forgiveness group:

SP4: ... allowed you to be and express yourself and say things you would not otherwise say.

Whilst this, in isolation, is a positive outcome, the heightened extent to which, *for this prisoner*, the group represented a 'safe place' to 'show your true feelings' is starkly apparent when he discusses the extent to which he feels that he must conceal his feelings from others in the prison environment:

SP4:...(pause) I dunno, I mean, prison's a kind of hard environment to really show your true feelings and stuff, you know what I mean. I mean, I might walk around, and put on a smile on my face, everyone thinks I'm alright but inside I'm, I'm dying inside...I mean, many a night I lay in bed and cry myself to sleep. But that's not something I let anyone else see.

This is one of the key strengths of the forgiveness project. From the perspective of prisoners, the group provided a rare opportunity for 'pause', 'calm' and 'reflection'. Many prisoners described a movement from feeling isolated, alienated, mistrustful and hostile, and perceiving forgiveness as a sign of 'weakness', to regarding forgiveness and 'expressing yourself' as a sign of *strength*. For some younger offenders, this movement was linked to the powerful and challenging normative developmental process of 'growing up' or 'becoming a man'.

SP4:... (pause) I dunno, I mean, prison's a kind of hard environment to really show your true feelings and stuff, you know what I mean. I mean, I might walk around, and put on a smile on my face, everyone thinks I'm alright but inside I'm, I'm dying inside... I mean, many a night I lay in bed and cry myself to sleep. But that's not something I let anyone else see.

A number of interviewees were cautious about their future, hoping not to end up back in prison but unsure of themselves. Even in these cases though, they talked about how they were trying to change and engage more and how such change was “*Since the forgiveness*”.

Means of Referral and Prior Expectations

When trying to understand further any such changes, it is important to try to ascertain people's prior expectations and motivations for undertaking TFP in prison as well as how they encountered the programme itself. Means of referral on to TFP programmes seemed to vary but were typically based on self referral following a visit to the wing by a TFP facilitator or “*someone [who] come onto the wing*” (MP5). This might include a recommendation by a psychologist and some prisoners clearly felt that it would help them to attain licence/release in relation to their Earliest Date of Release (EDR). It was also clear that previous recommendations by other prisoners were influential:

SP3: Erm, I heard- I heard about it through, erm, other prisoners basically. Erm, when I first heard about it I thought it was actually- It's a Christian thing, you know done through the church really... Going by the name really - forgiveness project. But then afterwards I realised it wasn't actually a religious thing, it's more of, you know, a personal thing for prisoners really and- I heard it through other prisoners basically, and that's when I looked and enquired into it.

SP7: Most, mostly prisoners, like.

SS2: ... prisoners do it because other prisoners tell them that it's worthwhile.

There were a few prisoners however who heard about TFP through more formal means:

SP12:... my Carat worker put me forward for the course

SP10: Er, well it was put across to me, erm, um, through the mental health team and the CPN... And, um, general word of mouth, round, you know, CPN mostly. People who'd done it.

Both prisoners and staff reported that their initial expectations were unclear, e.g.:

MS4: Well they're initially not quite sure what they're going to be doing so they can be quite wary... Um, but those who've been a part of it seem very positive, about it, erm....

They soon seemed reassured, as is demonstrated in this exchange between participant MP6 and the interviewer, M:

MP6: Ah, basically, ah, I found out through my case worker. So my case worker told me I had to do it as part of my targets, before I leave jail. So if you don't do your targets that you get set you don't get your early release.

M: And what was your thoughts on it, when they first told you about it?

MP6: To be honest yeah, I just thought, 'ah, forget it. Not gonna, waste my time'. But it actually turned out to be alright."

Within our cohort, there was one prisoner who dropped out of the TFP programme after initially signing up to take part and who also dropped out of the evaluation. One staff member considered him directly:

MS2: Yeah, I, I don't think that _____ [MP2] has got any positive thinking skills as such. I don't think he ever has thought about the consequences of his actions....Erm, he's really, really impulsive. So he does stuff and then thinks about it later. He's quite- He doesn't trust anybody. So... I think the, I think the forgiveness project would be fantastic for him if we could get him to engage, and keep him engaged to complete it, because I think it would give him a lot more awareness. But I think at the moment he, he doesn't trust anybody, he's got no remorse for what he's done.

The staff member then moved on to suggest ways to improve initial understanding of TFP's intervention and possible ways to better inform potential participants in the programme and thereby better engage with people such as MP2:

MS2: Prior to, to the course actually starting. Erm, builds a relationship and kind of develops trust with that person. If he's really clear on, on the whole point of the course and what's happening on the course, maybe a little bit in advance of the course I think he would probably be easier to engage. Because he would know what he's walking into, rather than being suspicious. He would understand, what the course is about and I think also, if the course was available to, to all young people. So if it was rolled out as part of an education, session. Like normal education session. Then he'd, probably be more willing to do it, because there'd be other people around him doing it. Erm, so it could be that the group he was on there was nobody else from the wing on there...Erm, but by kind of making the course a general, like available to everybody, that would probably be easier. And also to do it where he's got, you know, people that he is familiar with on the course....and maybe having a relationship with the person who's facilitating as well, would all help.

One area in which expectations may also be challenged is the presence of uniformed staff within workshops.

SS3: But, like I say, I've sat in with three of them so far, and they've been pretty calm, really. Um, I think as long as there's an officer around, to remind them that if they- 'Cos I know that there was some resistance to it, first time I was in there, but I think, um, 'cos they don't tend to- Sometimes they don't open as much if there's a uniformed member of staff there. But, as long as you kind of blend in with the background and don't force yourself into it, I think it was, ah...

Motivations for joining

Interviewees may have had unclear expectations of TFP but many had identifiable reasons for joining the workshops:

SP8: I do not want to come back to prison

SP1: Well I, I, I wanted forgiveness from the victim of the traffic accident I had. And also forgiveness from his mother and family. I felt that, you know, I wanted that, and, um, I felt by coming for the forgiveness I could possibly be, er, work out how I could get it but I do just pray that they forgive me. That's how I do it really...But I regularly ask them for forgiveness and that's all I can do. And that somehow, er, lifts the load of the remorseful feelings I have of doing, you know, carrying out the accident I had.

M: Okay. So, you regularly ask. Have you, been in contact with them-?

SP1: No, no, I haven't. Well I can't, obviously the dead guy I can't ask him.

M: And the family? [slightly overlapping]

SP1: No, I, I. [clears throat] No, I don't feel that I [clears throat] that I'd really want to go down those lines. It, well it would probably upset them a lot, would probably upset me a lot.

[Later in the same interview]

M: Okay. Erm, I was just picking up on the way you phrased it, because you said that you, you want to ask them. Is that, you want to ask them in a letter, or...?

SP1: No no no, I, ah, no I, I don't feel I want to go that far, with the mother and the family. I just feel that, er, I'm comfortable at this point with just, erm, asking them for forgiveness, and just hoping that through my prayers that they do forgive me. I shall never know, obviously, but, erm, I don't feel I actually really want contact as such because I feel it would be very upsetting for them.

Although their expectations were not clearly focussed, the reasons given for undertaking TFP--and frequently the main motivation for change overall-- in most of the young offenders, were their Mums and other Family members. As already mentioned, this was sometimes brought up in conjunction with EDR but the family theme was well developed and ran through the accounts from young offenders and older prisoners:

MP10: Erm, it's just to see my family, you know. 'Cos I've got four sisters at home. Just need to like get out of here and take care of them and stuff. You know, and that's when _____'s story come in. It's like, if me, or my brother, were out on the street and one of us gets shot and dies or something what would my mum go through? You know, knowing that her sons are not there. Like it must hurt her now knowing that both her sons are in prison. She hasn't got any, like, boys there with her. But, you know, I actually couldn't imagine what she's go through if one of her sons was to die.

It is also worth noting that although family motives were strong, the intra-familial relationships were often difficult as well. One young offender reported that his mother was herself in prison and that his father was routinely violent; another offender was keen to get out and stay out of institutions as his Mum had life threatening health issues and "I'm her main carer" as his Dad is alcoholic and suicidal.

Most impact/what's effective?

When considering what was the effective part of TFP in prisons and what had the most impact, prisoners and staff repeatedly identified the inspiration and influence of the speakers. Additionally, within our interviews, there were several phrases or words that recurred within the young offenders' accounts. Unsurprisingly, "forgiveness" was prominent throughout and a number mentioned "learning about consequences". Staff spoke of prisoners who had moved emotionally, for example:

SS1:... he spoke about some really powerful stuff, about his childhood and some really nasty stuff that happened to him. And how much anger he was carrying around because of what happened to him. And how he was almost able to, remove that anger, and, was, and that enabled his thinking process to be, to be, to be broader. And he was able to deal with what had happened to him as a child and was able to, almost... Rather than being angry with the perpetrator, would rather have just spoken with the perpetrator and just asked, "Why?". [pause] So, I'm not sure if he'd forgiven the perpetrator, but there was enough there for him to remove the anger. And, and, start thinking about what questions he would like to ask.

SS2: I think the programme introduces prisoners to inspiring people...Um, which is both the speakers, but also to some other prisoners. And I guess this is a controversial thing to say but there are inspiring people who are imprisoned.

Some impacts can sound relatively minor, but indicate a major change in how people respond to the regime and others within it:

SP4: Yeah, I said it on the course, I mean there's people on the course I'd have never spoke to, I'd have walked past every day all these years and never said a word to them. But because we was part of a group you interact with them and we got to know each other, and that that person was alright, you know.

More profound changes may include how prisoners perceive themselves and those they have hurt:

SP7: Yeah, just like how things could really affect people, not just assume kind of thing. You know like if a crime happens against someone, you just think 'oh well, that's not the end of the world', but it can have like a deeper effect, and emotional effect where they can't sleep, they become scared, paranoid. You know, they may be- And another thing, concerning my particular crime as well, it made me think a lot about my victim as well...And, you know, it was quite like, not, you know, not like- I feel a lot more, how can I say it, more... I feel a lot more remorse for the person,

'cos I know, now looking back on it, that, you know, I could have prevented someone from, probably, he's probably affected now so if I knew these things before then maybe it could have helped him from being affected 'cos I'm pretty sure he's still affected, you know like, 'cos of that course, if you- If I look on things from the course, the forgiveness project thing, I can see that, it's affected him a lot more than I ever thought, or any of my co-Ds would think.

Two key ideas from the young offenders were that they were “calm” or “calmer” and that this phase of their lives was “just a little pause”. This last phrase seems to have been used by one of the TFP speakers in more than one context and it had particular resonance. The staff considered TFP’s strengths to include how well they engaged with participants from the outset, that they changed and developed thinking skills and the space provided to prisoners to reflect on themselves and others in ways hitherto alien to them in their cells, and beyond:

MS3: ... Erm, but I think just the style of the project is certainly conducive from the outset, and it was, um, often like it would start with _____’s story which took the emphasis away from them, um, and just gave them that time to relax into it. And, from what I saw it was very fun, there was a lot of things going on, so they would make things, and they would watch videos, and discuss, do life maps. It was, it was always changing to keep them engaged, so I think straight away that probably caught their attention and made them, yeah, at ease.

SS1: Some of these guys have come out and it completely changes their way of thinking....Attitude. Attitude towards their crime. Attitudes towards others. Um... As I say, some, some more so than others, but you see these guys, you see these, these guys that come into

Phenomenological Point of Interest: Thoughtfulness and reflection

Prisoners mentioned a wide range of benefits when discussing positive effects of TFP but another overarching theme was increased thoughtfulness. This not only brought practical benefits such as improved perspective taking and ability to empathise, but also a common sense of feeling calmer, more relaxed, and engaging in more critical and searching self-reflection:

SP3: I've, I've become more settled really. I've become more at ease with myself. And obviously when your mind's at ease you can deal with situations better...[and later in the same interview...]. You know it's the- The whole process of the, you know, going through the process of the forgiveness course, right. It makes you think about yourself, and the kind of person you are. And, and what you've done really, so, that's what I mean by- If I hadn't done the forgiveness course I wouldn't have looked at myself so deeply really.

In one case, an increased thoughtfulness and ability to take others’ perspectives was so notable that it was even surprising to the prisoner himself. An interesting link is made here with identity; there is a strong implication that the surprise at his own recent change stems from a prior false assumption that identity and character traits (such as dealing with personal conflict in an uncritical or impulsive way) are relatively immutable:

SP7: I'll tend to use things against- I'll use it against her. I dunno like, I'm just- I'm just shocked in myself how I dealt with it, I thought I'd have been very opposite to what I am, but, I'm not so. That's- To me that's like a surprise in myself really...

Running through these accounts of increased reflection was a strong sub-theme of externalising old behaviours, and viewing past behaviour as entirely separate from current identities. There were of course some participants who either did not describe such dramatic changes, or did not appear to feel that they had a need to change.

a group, and they're sitting there and they've got a face like, "This is just another course."...And then when some of the people tell their stories, some of the facilitators from outside, you see these big men, that, think they're emotionally and physically tough, and give it all the Charlie Big Potatoes on the landing, and you see them in there and they're, they're crying. And they're affected, and they're paying attention, and they're, they're literally got a look of shock on their face. And that type of thing can only affect you. It doesn't matter who you are and how tough you are.

MS2: Again, if, if you can change the, their mindsets and the way, and like develop their thinking skills....So like they more think about the consequences of what they may do. So if they're planning to go out and do something, if they can develop those skills, make them think what might happen if they do do it and they get caught, or what's going to happen to their victim, stuff like that. I think it will, over time, change, change the way that they are. Erm, if they've got a better understanding of, the impact that they will have.

SS3: My understanding is the central idea of the, of the Forgiveness Project is that, isn't that forgiveness itself isn't actually what it's really about. That's a side issue. Um, basically it's about, getting rid of your baggage, involved in, your emotions to it. So, when they talk about forgiving someone that's done something to you, it's not really, really forgiving them, it's about getting rid of that power that person has over you. And, certainly in a lot of the stories that has come out, where it's- The forgiveness side of it is, is the root that you reach, otherwise whichever event, that event controls you. And you get rid of that control and, and you're more relaxed afterwards. So I think once they've realised it's not about forgiving someone exactly, it's more about moving on, and being enabled to move on letting that go, I think it's going to help a lot of them.

MS3: Erm, I definitely think they take away how it applies to them. They are required to do some homework, which often they did, which again, from experience [both laugh] is often quite a trial. So actually to get them to do it overnight.....erm, so for them to have that in mind 'Oh, I'm going to go back to my room and now I'm going to think about this further'. Some of the stuff they used to come back with was really sort of poignant. And made them reflect on- If I remember right they had to answer questions on someone I can never forgive, someone I would like to forgive, yeah, so, I think it helped them to really put it in a personal way to themselves, applied to themselves, rather than just talk about the general concept of forgiveness.

SS3: But as long as you, let them come up with the idea, most of them start thinking, and their thought process, although they're guided along, it's, it's, ah, it's mostly their own work, and therefore, once they've convinced themselves of something, they're more likely to carry it

through. And that's the main difference I think with this one than anything I've seen before.

MS4: They also find it hard to offer forgiveness, there's a sense of, strong sense of, justice in in a strange way.....for people, particularly their family and friends, and if they've been offended against, they want to see, anybody who has done that brought to, justice, by their own summary justice. So, breaking that sense, sort of sense of having to do that themselves, and allowing others to bring, bring them to the law's attention rather than them going around and knocking on their door.

MS1: So, erm, under those circumstances they can think about how they're affecting their families, erm, and seek I suppose with the victims and everything at end of the day, so they want to be forgiven.

Young offenders found the facilitators deeply motivating and one particularly influential matter seems to have been that the facilitators and rest of the TFP team have taken the time to provide ongoing support. As one staff participant observed, this is not just the preserve of TFP but it seemed clear that the facilitators go out of their way to provide support. The following interchange between a young offender (MP5) and the interviewer (M) illustrates this well.

MP5: Yeah. I jotted loads of things down, after that Forgiveness Project. And I wrote like a little script to ____.

M: Mm. Was that a letter.

MP5: A letter, yeah, yeah. She goes 'write me a paragraph on how you think, about my story'. So I wrote a little paragraph... So then she wrote back to me in jail... Afterwards, I was surprised man... I was thinking 'She weren't going to write to me, a lot of people chat shit but never write to you'. [M laughs] She wrote back to me. I was surprised... It felt good, like good. That she wrote back to me.

M: So it was good hearing...

MP5: Yeah. She got in touch with me, I didn't write to her... I wrote that letter in jail, and like give her that letter in the LRC [Learning Resource Centre], and then she must have gone home and then a month later I got a letter, and I'm thinking 'Who's this? It's from ____'. So I'm shocked that she could actually go out of her way, to write me a letter.

M: So it's a surprise that she would do that?

MP5: Yeah, yeah.

M: Erm, and how did you feel about reading what she's written?

MP5: I felt good man, I felt like it's my own mother speaking to me. Like those same words she was saying, my mum would say, innit.

The ongoing support was something brought up in the staff interviews as well although it was recognised that this could (should?) be provided within the wider prison regime and not be solely the responsibility of TFP:

MS3: Yeah I think it's really important and I think they were in touch after. I also think that that is important too, that if they do come in and potentially open a, um- Not a can of worms, but do you know what I mean if they open up, the sort of conversation around it and it leads to things like erm, him meeting his victims mother, I think it is really important that the support remains there and they don't sort of just come in and leave. Even if it is for staff to follow up, that there is that, follow up for them.

M: And do you think that's, that's always in place? That there will be that, follow up?

MS3: Um, I'm not sure if there is now, I think, um, something like that probably would fall within psychology, but there's always agencies within the prison that that could be referred to. So whether it be chaplaincy or whether it still be the Forgiveness Project getting in touch with them, I think it could always be arranged for it to be followed up so.

Positive experiences and Outcomes:

The staff were quite effusive in their response to TFP finding it generally very positive:

SS1: There's there's a lot can benefit, you've got violent crime, um, persistent criminals. But you've also got those people who commit crime... I had a guy the other day I was talking to and I said to him, "Look, why are you committing crime? Why are you doing this? You've done all these drug rehabilitation courses, you've done this, you've done that." He said, um, "Because I get out there and I start working, and then I think about what I've done in my past and I think I'm a scumbag, I don't deserve this. So I end up going back, stealing something, and buying some drugs with it." So he's got issues. So, I recommend him for the Forgiveness Project. I put him on there, he starts talking about his issues, he starts thinking about his victims. He starts thinking about how he can change, and, hopefully, it'll change him. Should change him 'cos it's strong enough.

MS3: Erm, I think it's really positive, erm, yeah I think it's great, and I really like that the idea of forgiveness is separate from any other underlying thing. Like they're very clear from the beginning that it's not to do with religion, erm, or anything kind of- Ah, it's just free for all in that sense. I think that's great, I think it- Like I said I think they explore it from both ends. So who they might need to forgive as well as whether they need forgiveness.

M: Hm. And you said you thought that was something that was quite unique to forgiveness?

MS3: Yeah, yeah, I think it's- I think it's unique in here. Because, like I said, it's mostly on them for them to reflect on the damage they've done rather than the damage that's been done to them. So I think that's really important. Yeah, it is, it is totally unique to any other programme running here at the moment, yeah, so I do think it's very positive.

SS3: And you can almost see the guy sitting there, going, "Bloody hell, I'm doing this to fix up my council house.", or, "I'm doing this 'cos my old man used to hit me when I was a kid.", or, you know, "I'm doing this 'cos I got chucked out of a job.". And you can see them saying, "D'you know what-", seeing how actual, what's happened to them in their life is nowhere near as what's happened to this speaker, who is brave enough to come and say these things, which also then helps them open up. Um, and you see, "You know what, there's no reason for me to continue this.". I've seen that and I think we're gonna get some results.

SS2: Ah, especially in a local prison you tend to see failure. You know, lots of very circular lifestyles where you see the same people coming back. Ah, and people whose lives have been unhappy and ah, not contributed to the public good. But you do also come across people who against tremendous odds have turned their lives around. And they've started to do that in prison. Um...and you come across people who are just showing courage in the face of adversity, it's not to excuse what they've done to be here, um, but the Forgiveness Project is probably, probably one of its benefits is that it does allow prisoners to deal with the harm that's been done to them. Which on the whole the criminal justice system puts to one side.

The importance of acknowledging prisoners' vulnerabilities without excusing their crimes, was returned to later by the same interviewee

SS2: Forgiveness deal with, it deals with the victimisation of prisoners without excusing it and without losing the equally or more important element of the harm they've done to others.

M: And how do you think it manages to strike that, that balance?

SS2: [pause] Well it seems to me it's really it's maturely thought through that the, the choice of speakers, the quality of speakers and the, if you like, the sort of corporate knowledge within the project...

The staff were also all able to cite specific examples of positive change and most of the time, were convinced that this was as a result of TFP, whether on its own or in conjunction with the rest of the regime:

M: What sort of improvements have you seen there?

MS4: Erm, well, certainly a calmer attitude towards things. Less 'I'm gonna sort it out', more, erm... That's in relation to family and friends, as far as victims are concerned. I think the fact that people have got much clearer heads and more time to think in here, so there's an opportunity to reflect on the process as well as the actual project itself. The boys have got a lot of time to, to reflect on what they've heard and that reflective process I think takes place as well.

M: Hm. And, again, what's your impression? Do you think that's to do with the Forgiveness Project, or is it-? You mentioned just being inside giving them time to think.

MS4: A combination of both... And not being distracted by, um, peer pressure or whatever addictive activities going on, or, you know, whatever else is going on outside for them... There is time for them to think about things here, with a clear head.

M: Yeah. So, all of those things give them, the opportunity to think.

MS4: Yeah.

M: Erm, how much do you think that translates into a change in behaviour.

MS4: Ah, that's what I really long for for them....

SS1: Um... It's had some, it's had a massive impact on, you know even lifers. I spoke to a probation officer today who said that one of her lifers was... He didn't wanna engage, he didn't want to do anything, he went on the Forgiveness course, er, Project, and now he's engaging. And he's doing really well, and he's focusing on his future.

The changes or positive outcomes commented upon were not just within the young offenders and prisoners. It was clear that sometimes, other people could be affected by the impact of TFP on the offenders, including bereaved victims of crime:

MS3: There was one boy, that we had, erm, who was really touched by _____'s story... He was in, for like a gang-related murder, erm, and as like a direct result of attending the Forgiveness Project he, went on to meet the mother of his victim.... I think that, had a real profound effect on him and like the mother was, sort of, forgiving. I don't know to what extent but I know they ended the meeting with a hug.... Stuff like that. So I think that's probably massive for him.

M: Okay. Erm, what do you think it was about the programme that had that big of an effect on that particular individual?

MS3: I think it was definitely _____'s story, and, just seeing it from, the other side of- So like his life is now here, or was here, he's gone now, and living with the consequences of that but being able to see on the reverse of that how someone else is living with the consequences of his actions. Yeah I think _____ spent quite a lot of time with, talking to him about it and, and erm, I always got the feeling he was remorseful about what happened from the start, anyway, so I don't know if that sort of openness played into it at all, but I do remember he did get a lot of support from the the guys from the forgiveness project.

Although these interviews were conducted relatively soon after completing TFP and they are still incarcerated, some of the offenders' attitudes had clearly changed and in some cases, behaviours too:

SP7: Yeah, so it did happen round the same time, so I dunno if it's just a coincidence, or not but it did- That is something that has changed in me, even she said that to me. And it's definitely a change of thinking. You

Phenomenological Point of Interest: Masculinity and vulnerability

Prisoners often highlighted the emotional impact of TFP, some of them noting that it was unusual for them to display strong emotion in prison as it didn't fit with the image that people typically maintain whilst in prison. In most cases, it was the speakers' stories that prompted the strongest emotional responses.

Some described their general aversion to showing vulnerability as something that they had adopted in the past, but had since moved beyond. Unsurprisingly this was more common amongst the older prisoners, although it was present in some young offenders' accounts. Linking back to the ideas of TFP being a 'safe space', the need to save face and construct an external image of strength and toughness was notable for its absence from the workshop participants.

Staff echoed and corroborated the idea that TFP can emotionally affect those prisoners who ordinarily present an image of strong, invulnerable masculinity:

SS1: And then when some of the people tell their stories, some of the facilitators from outside, you see these big men, that, think they're emotionally and physically tough, and give it all the Charlie Big Potatoes on the landing, and you see them in there and they're, they're crying.

Interestingly there were some contrasts in the way that interviewees drew on notions of masculinity. In the quote above, the phrase 'big men' is linked to a kind of hyper-masculine emotional and physical resilience. Alternatively, the prisoner quoted below equates masculinity with emotional maturity and an ability to control past violent, impulsive behaviours:

JP1: Like 'this person owes me a pack of biscuits, right I've got to go punch him up, 'cos he didn't pay me on time, I've got to go hit him, 'cos if I don't hit him it makes me look like an, like an idiot in front of everyone else and I can't have that'. You know, just, weak minded, you know what I mean. And I just, grew out of that and I was thinking, 'what the fuck was I thinking'. So yeah, definitely I'm more mature. I'm a man now, so. It's good.

It would be over-simplistic to characterise participants as having generally moved beyond a need to mask vulnerabilities. Even those who distanced themselves from presenting a false outer image and acknowledged the value of reflecting on their own emotional state, at times still described the need to behave in a certain way as a daily reality of prison life.

This presents the possibility that behaviour change may not come across as strongly when outside 'safe' spaces and situations, such as the TFP group room, or being interviewed as part of this evaluation. It can be inferred that whilst the overt demonstration of any change may be context specific, there is still an importantly underlying phenomenological change in how participants view themselves.

know like, thinking of other people, her point of, her side of things innit.

MP1: You don't, you don't just sit there and go 'well he's done that, so they're automatically bad'. You just sit there and you go 'well, they're just normal people'. So...

M: So when did that change happen?

MP1: Well... I think it was just after the forgiveness project. It helped me to realise that people are- Not everyone's a bad person. But some people are, but not everyone.

MP6:... I'd just say 'think'. I, I'll like think about my actions now. And just think about like, the wider picture, who, who else am I going to affect, 'cos at first I'm just thinking 'yeah, I'm just going to affect myself'. No, you affect your community, most

of all you affect your family.

MP10: Erm. (pause) I'm not sure before I would just, if I was to get in a situation with someone, I'd think bad of them afterwards, I'd think 'he's not the right kind of guy'. I might just think it's not just his fault, it's my fault as well. It's not just him, it's me as well [later in the interview]..Because- If I'm a better person and I treat people right then they'll treat me the same, d'you know, 'cos like not people, not a lot of people treat me the way I want them to treat me because maybe that's because I don't treat them right. But you know, that's one thing that I've noticed. And I've been working on that and I've done pretty well on it...[later in the interview] ...Actually, one of the- one of the things at the moment, erm, is that I've stopped speaking to my friends that I used to hang around with before. I don't phone them. I don't want to get out and go back to them, you know...That's quite been hard for me cos I've known them for years, d'you know...I've, kind of had to make a big decision, to not, go back, go back with them. So yeah.

Engagement with other interventions or courses:

There are a number of reasons why prisons may support group work and non accredited programmes but one strong incentive is that such interventions may help facilitate changes in the way an individual responds to situations. Staff's responses during the interviews indicated that they clearly felt both that prisoners were changed and that this change could be carried forward into other domains within the regime, beyond TFP. In some cases, the ways in which change was conceptualised was both nuanced and theoretically apposite.

SS2: Um, I'm very struck on desistance theory, which I'm sure you've come across, that actually the task is not, is not about changing people, it's about supporting a decision to change...And, identifying the moment when somebody might be ready to make that decision, ah, or to take a step along to taking that decision, um, is, is a huge part of what we should be about, because we haven't got people for long enough to go through all the issues that they've got, and even if did have, if they're not motivated...

Interviews with offenders included material designed to explore whether their behaviour or approaches were changing, and whether that was both associated with TFP and sustained thereafter:

M: Erm, so, er, any, any other ways you've been able to develop that self-control? You mentioned...

SP3: Yeah, I'm, I'm paying more attention. I do- My whole day's revolved around my religion basically. Mostly pray five times a day. There's something, I learnt the Qur'an when I was young, you know because I didn't really pay much attention to it. It was just reading, reading of it fluently, plus you have to memorise everything. I realised that everything that I've memorised is just gone really, so, I've, ah- That's what I mean by everything happening for a reason really. So even though this- I've turned this round really. Even though it's- Initially it's a negative thing, but I've turned it round into a positive thing, positive thing, like-

M: What is that, being here...?

SP3: Being here in prison really. Being, being on the outside I always used to say 'I don't have time to sit down. I hardly even have time to go to the mosque.' I used to pray at home and this and that...But here, you know, I've turned it round, maybe this has all happened 'cos I couldn't find time on the outside, right...Now, I've been given all that time that I need really! You know, so, erm, it gives me that time to improve myself.

One way in which actual change could have been demonstrated would have been within participants' decisions to engage with other programmes within the system. For some short sentence prisoners, this may not have been an issue; yet, it is noticeable that none of the young offenders interviewed had engaged with other programmes. One reported that he was about to start some "with psychology". Another said that he had wanted to take the More programme and Victim Awareness but couldn't and it was unclear why not. The picture was more positive amongst the older prisoners, and recognised as such by the staff:

SP1: No, I haven't no. Oh, stress management, I've done, yes, stress management...Erm, well stress management is really dealing with, the, you know the stress of your daily life. Erm, whereas forgiveness is really as I saw it was really all about re, reorganising the whole thing in your mind..."

SS3: I think, I think, the, the important thing is, you've got to get that weight off. Whatever it is, that, you regret, and you end to move on from, that's like a big weight, alright, and until you can shift that, [clears throat] onto the irrelevant shelf, or to, at least on to the get over it shelf, and you can move away from that, then they've got- 'Cos you've got a lot of guys in here who say, "I can't, there's no point in me doing that.". What's the point of doing that, I'm not going to get anything out of it.". You know, they're very negative. So if you can move that reason for the negativity away, then they will automatically start being more positive and then the people trying to get on education and courses like that, [clears throat] there's more chance of reaching them, I think anyway.

SP3: I done the listeners course. I just finished that on Saturday...That was a, month, month course basically. I just finished that really. Got my results on Saturday, and passed. and, er, I'm working in xxx. Just finished my NVQ second level, as a waiter, and my ambition is, or my goal is to go into the kitchen side of xxx, and learn to cook really...I think er, erm, erm. I, I've, I've become more settled really. I've become more at ease with myself. And obviously when your mind's at ease you can deal with situations better. Erm... Erm, I mean I'm less anxious, I've less tense really. So it's very difficult to irritate me really. I mean, when I phone home for example. If there's a situation, I don't let it irritate me. Because I've learnt that, you know, it's pointless to become irritable because there's nothing you can do anyway.

SS2: Forgiveness can provide a safe place for people to say things that they need to say, but also to receive some affirmation and support when they do say. Um, in terms of staff I mean the staff who, supervise it will

say that they think that they see prisoners behaving differently at the end to the beginning, and, um, you know that it starts with a large group of prisoners, you know, in a large room, listening to a speaker, um, you know, that, that almost feels the same way that a school assembly feels that, you know, there's a few people at the front who really want to pay attention, there's a few people in the middle who are, ah, probably alright, and there's also people mucking about in the back row. Ah, um, so, and you can see the dynamic change. Ah, and start notice that they're used to having to police that type of gathering and you don't really have to police, that gathering where people are gripped by, what's said. And we don't, you know, we don't select people that go on the Forgiveness Project on the basis that they're all nice tidy well behaved prisoners. Um, so staff will see some difficult, and, ah, unruly people attending that project. So, ah, you know, there are some, changes in the institutional behaviour that you can see. You know, none of us in a prison are in a position to say whether that's more than a temporary change in institutional behaviour.

SP7: Um, I've- I'm doing, um- I done the Samaritans, you know, to train as a listener. I just completed that, and, um, and yeah obviously that deals with a lot of emotional things and you know, like, and it, it's- It's kind of like an eye opener and I feel like that kind of, you know, trying to correct things, you know, like what I've done wrong, and you, like trying to help, the system, like that kind of thing. And, it's quite, quite um- How can I say it, it's- 'Cos obviously when- As dealing with Samaritans and being a listener, you will have to deal with, like, vulnerable prisoners, you know like sex offences, people that kind of crime and obviously if you're going to speak to someone who's like, say, for example, a paedophile or rapist, you've got to leave your thoughts at the door... Oh yeah, um, I started in the xxx now...doing my NVQ and that. And obviously that- That when I come out I've got, um. I'm doing two NVQs, and I'll come out with a job as well so it's like, you know it's a great opportunity and it's a way to like turn my life around as well.

The idea of a change being a process was acknowledged by staff and prisoners, with all groups identifying TFP as instrumental.

SP7: Um, it definitely, I'd say definitely started with the forgiveness project.

SP3: It's part of the process. It's er, erm, the forgiveness course helped me to put into perspective, all like- Yeah, it's difficult to say like it's because of the course, the forgiveness course itself, but the forgiveness course helped me to make me who I am basically. The change, the changed person as such. (pause). Mmm. (pause) You know it's the- The whole process of the, you know, going through the process of the forgiveness course, right. It makes you think about yourself, and the kind of person you are. And, and what you've done really, so, that's what I

mean by- If I hadn't done the forgiveness course I wouldn't have looked at myself so deeply really.

SS1: Something happens in that room where they open up, and, it doesn't happen overnight, it happens over a long period. And they, they start to, to think about their whole behaviour, and their whole attitude and their whole, way of thinking. And so, yeah, you know, it's a great motivator.

This recognition of TFP as an opening for other programmes to build on was identified more than once:

SS2: Um, but the thing that I think we've probably been slow to recognise is that doing all that long-term work and all that teaching work if you like, programmes like Enhanced Thinking Skills, um, is probably wasted effort unless there is a shaft of insight first...And the programme might give that. I mean ETS obviously uses peer review and challenge to try and achieve that. Um, Forgiveness uses that but the direct involvement of victims and the direct involvement of victims with such, gripping stories to tell, um, I think probably, um, has a better chance of... I can use any number of analogies, I don't know, sort of getting people in to open the book and look at page 1.

Although acknowledging the additional support needs posed by "vulnerable prisoners" attending TFP, interviewee SS2 also identified its possibilities with sex offenders:

SS2:... 'cos as I say, typically we've got people who committed very serious crime in here, but if you looked at a typical population attending the Forgiveness, ah, Project here then, you know, lots of them will be going back into the community fairly soon, um, they've committed a pretty serious crime to be sent to prison, but they've received pretty short sentence or they haven't been sentenced at all yet. Um, that's not true with sex offenders. Sex offenders are likely to have very long sentences. And are likely to be needing to do longer accredited programmes during their sentence to get released and to be safe when they are released. So this, this function of grabbing the attention and providing insight and motivation with a group of sex offenders, if it's achieved that and I think it probably can, then the system has to be set up to then deliver on the future support and the future intervention, in a way that isn't quite the same with the general population.

Although the programme was clearly seen as having an impact, it was also clear that a number of prisoners have deep seated problems and vulnerabilities. Evidence ranged from scores on the standardised scales (see discussion) through to significant discourse from the interviews. The following comments are all taken from the same interview but from more than one place within it:

But I'm pretty messed up at the moment, as you can see. And I been, I've been in some agonising pain. And, er, you know, I'm not really focused on, focusing on, trying to get through the day, on a day to day basis, you know being so messed up with pain.

[M: Mm. And how does it affect your state of mind, being in that much-?]

I, I just, I dunno, just hate the system and- I just hate the system, I hate everything, I just... Couldn't rationalise. I mean I come in here, came here, got myself arrested, watched all the people go, you know, stab me in the back, turned me over and, you know, I dunno just, er, when's it gonna stop. You know what I mean 'cos when I come out I, er, I'm possibly going to be living on the street.

I don't know, I don't know how I'd cope at the moment, d'you know what I mean? I just- I just have to cope with it. You know, you know as I said I've got a lot of issues [indistinct] I get up every morning 4 o'clock. no matter what sleeping tablets they give me, and now 'cos of this, where it's got worse it's. it's just agonising, all I can do in here is [indistinct] myself. To pull through, to pull through, and get better. I don't know how to get better, I don't know how to pray. I try, but it's no good to me.

I've changed, yeah, I've changed. I'd like to say for the better, but, you know, sometimes I get negativity and the old... The addict me comes out [indistinct] defects of character still hits me now and then. For the large part, I try and deal with it.

Nah, nah. I'll just say, want to say I'm glad I done the forgiveness 'cos it did put something in me, y'know what I mean, like when I- If I get over this I, I'll always remember it, you know what I mean. Remember, what people were saying to me.

Problems caused by TFP?

When asked directly as to whether there were any problems that had been caused by or related to TFP in prisons, some staff were at first unable to think of any examples. The response below being typical:

M: Okay. Erm, on the other side can you think of any lads who've maybe done badly after they've been through, the Forgiveness Project?

MS3: [pause] No. [laughs]

M: That's fine.

MS3: No, I can't. [laughs]

However, there were some concerns identified:

SS2: Certainly where it's brought up issues, we did one programme for, ah, vulnerable prisoners who were mostly if not all sex offenders... Um, and I was, I was concerned that, we may be weren't set up to deal with the potential consequences of that. Um... Um, and if, if we were going to do that again, I think I would want more reassurance about the framework for, support both during and especially after the programme. And what we could move people on to

SS3: ...I think we had, at least one guy, on one of three days who didn't come. After the first day because he couldn't handle it, alright and so hopefully that would have been passed on to staff to, to, to notice whether or not he had any problems with that. So, it's not for everybody. I mean it's not, group work's not easy. But then I don't think that it's supposed to be.....There is a chance there- I don't think it's necessarily that great one. There's a chance there that people could become slightly more depressed, ah, as a result. Certainly there, there is, um, sometimes with one or two of them you notice that there's a bit of tension 'cos they've looked at, you know, themselves, been thinking about that. Um, they've had to revisit stuff which they'd rather not have...So, it, I think once it's out there, and they get past that, you know, sort of, anger at revisiting it, or shame at revisiting it, um, then I think they'll, they'll feel better. And in the short term there might be a few problems, but I think the three day course is enough for them to start working past that. I think if you just got them to open up, and left it then I think you might have problems. But, um, from the depression point of view there is chance, um, but we do have good stuff in, in place so if a guy's feeling depressed he can come talk to us. And hopefully most of them can find somebody can listen, even if it's a listener rather than an officer, that they feel they can open up to.

Although the direct question did not always elicit particular examples, there was one case brought up after prompting, that we think it important to consider. MS1 reported bullying on the wing or "taxing" that seems to have started after TFP:

MS1: To do with the forgiveness project, or just generally? He's got problems in here with pretty much everybody! (laugh)..Basically he was being, erm, people were trying to tax him for stuff on the wing, and he told staff like we encourage them to do and some of the lads got moved, all the lads then blamed him and his co-D so they've been moved and they're restricted.

M: How much have those problems increased or stayed the same since forgiveness a few months ago?

MS1: When did he actually do the forgiveness project? I don't actually know you see.

M: [pause] It would be in September.

MS1: September. Ah, those problems have happened since September then. Because it's- He wouldn't b- That would have happened before any issues had occurred. They wouldn't have been able to go to group work or anything. So, the forgiveness pr, project happened first, and then all of these problems have, happened since. And I must admit, I, I am quite harsh with the lads sometimes and it depends on what the relationship is like between me and them. But I will give _____ a hard time, reflecting on, how he feels being intimidated and, bullied and... D'you know, in here, and maybe re, reflect on how his behaviour had impacted on his victims outside if you know what I mean.

M: Yep.

MS1: So, I think, yeah. I mean he couldn't have done the forgiveness project if he had the problems now, he couldn't mix.

M: Okay. Erm, so obviously it's really hard to say but why do you think he's had those issues recently? [pause] Can you see anything that's sparked it off?

MS1: Ah, not, not in his behaviour. Definitely not, I mean he's been bullied, he told staff, the staff moved the bullies, and the other lads on the wing and everybody else worked out, or presumed, presumed rightly, erm, that it was _____ and his roommate, that had 'grassed', as such. So, um, of course then they know a lot of people in here, and it could be anybody, that is walking along on mass move or something, so it's- Yeah, unfortunately, unfortunately it's the fact that he was being- They were being bullied, not their fault at all.

This example raises several issues including that there will be prisoners who could benefit from TFP but will be excluded for their own safety also, that the implementation of the anti-bullying and victimisation strategy had actually worsened the situation for those being "taxed" in this case. It is also worth considering here that TFP itself may have contributed to this situation, albeit unintentionally. To explore this further, we need to consider this case in more depth and we can see that the young offender concerned seems to have been positively affected by TFP. Earlier on in the interview, MS1 had highlighted how this particular young person had been positively influenced. The staff member was clear that there was a real change in the offender's attitude towards the victims of his offence and that he was engaging more completely and honestly with staff in relation to his offending behaviour. As MS1 had said, this positive transformation may not solely have been due to TFP but:

MS1: Well, it's a bit of a coincidence if he's done the forgiveness project, project hasn't he. So, erm, even though I haven't gone in depth about- Well I haven't gone in depth, into the programme at all with him because I don't, I don't think I'd had my report at the time from it, erm, so I haven't gone into that so I can only, assume, and if it's not it's a, a strange coincidence that because he's done forgiveness project.

Given this positive transformation, it is particularly disappointing to see that the young offender concerned was being restricted following victimisation. Although we do not have direct evidence for this, it is reasonable to surmise that the offender's greater confidence and trust in officers was at least partially brought about through TFP and that it is this greater trust that may have helped him to inform staff about the bullying which may have pre-dated the project or started after it. As MS1 indicated, what happened after informing staff, made matters worse for this young offender. It should be stressed that the implementation of the anti-bullying strategy is entirely outside the control of TFP and we do not seek to advocate that prisoners being bullied return to the situation of being unable to report their victimisation. We have highlighted this case as it brings into sharp relief the importance of situating and understanding the impact of TFP within a wider institutional

regime. Encouraging prisoners to interact more openly with staff should be a positive outcome⁶, this case shows that such matters are not simple.

Staff also identified a number of areas where problems could potentially occur, but where they were clear that they had not actually experienced them. These included disclosures being made that related to child protection or their own offending behaviour; if the numbers on the programme were too low and examples of personal trauma:

SS3: Well, I mean there's always a chance that someone will say something in there which we as a service wouldn't advise them to bring out....Obviously you've got crimes of a sexual nature which you, um, wouldn't be advisable [laughs slightly, then clears throat] for them, so I don't know the exact selection, how they select prisoners. I wonder if they do anything to, work round that, or whether it's just open to anybody. ... Um, because I don't know how much- There would be no camaraderie there. Certainly no one, I don't think any of the prisoners would, ah, think, "Well thank you for sharing and we'll understand you". So, there is a danger of that. Um, there, there's always a danger that they may go too far. We are dealing with volatile people.

SS1: Well, like I say, you're touching on some really, really, tough subjects. And these guys may have never spoken about that before so you, you get violence, you can get self-harm, you can get vulnerability. You know, a guy is learning that it's okay to sit in a room full of people and, and cry, a little bit. He may go back and start having a little cry, and ends up getting bullied for it... 'Cos he doesn't know, when to cry. When, he should feel comfortable to sit there and shed a tear. Or when he should... He's learning these things, as the course goes on. But you have- You can't develop these skills unless it's done over time, with experience. And these are the types of, of, of tools that most of us learn when we're children, and as we're growing up. But a lot of these guys haven't had that- The benefit of that. So they're learning a lot of their skills that we learnt as kids, they're learning it now.

MS4: Well, obviously there may be a lot of buried things there....That it could bring up from the past. Lots of lads say 'oh I can forgive anything but...'. Or 'I can forgive but I can't forget'...You know, so obviously problems are there, that are very long buried, that have caused, maybe caused, been part of the causes for them being here in the first place....So certainly, you know, those- People, lads that have spoken about past abuse.....of themselves. They find that very difficult to forgive....

M:... Is that, has that come up at all?

MS4: I haven't had it as a result of the programme.

⁶ It should also be noted that in interviewing the young offender, he chose not to disclose anything directly about the bullying to us. This did however, come up indirectly when he considered how he has changed himself and the ways in which he reacts to other people and problems.

Relatedly, it is important to consider whether something unpleasant and challenging is necessarily harmful in the long term or whether it can even be useful. Another section of the interview with MS1 below may be relevant in this context.

M: Okay. Do you think there's, any particular problems, that might be raised by the workshops. 'Cos you mentioned, or hearing about a couple of lads breaking down. Any other problem you could see?

MS1: I, well I don't think that that's a problem, personally....I think if they're, getting upset about hearing how, victims have been affected. If they're upset about that I think, it's, it's almost like... Show that the penny's dropped....Do you know what I mean. It's almost like that's not a problem. Other than if lads went round laughing about, telling other lads....But from what I can gather it's, erm, a confidential thing. There's always like a contract set up at the beginning of the course. And I've never heard another lad, say, or name anybody else that's broken down, not even a member of staff so I don't know who's ended up crying in those workshops. I know a few people have. Erm, issues... There might- I don't know what they talk about, whether the project goes into individual crimes. I mean, I would say probably not because that in itself could cause an issue between two members, group members anyway if somebody talks about a victim that they raped or something, or a female that they hit, or an old man that they mugged. Then, possibly other people in that group, wouldn't find those crimes acceptable and therefore I don't think... I don't know. I don't know, I don't, I don't think they would talk about individual crimes. Am I wrong?

M: No.

MS1: Or am I right?

M: Erm, no they don't.

MS1: They don't, right. So, erm, so that wouldn't be an issue. Do I see any other issues? No I don't. No.

This excerpt touches on some fundamental questions as to the nature and extent of challenge that the programme may need to pose, in order to provide the space for meaningful empathy to be elicited and sustained. Such an approach, needs to be balanced and nuanced if it is to be successful. In particular, there needs to be a recognition that in opening up emotional aspects of a person's interior life that hitherto have been unexplored, support needs are likely to arise.

Regime Interactions and Ongoing Support Needs

Staff and prisoners recognised that TFP workshops could change the dynamic between individual prisoners and officers and have a positive impact on the regime as a whole.

SS1: And a lot of these guys are scared, and don't know how to deal with their emotions, which is why we get a lot of violence. Um, that's why you get a lot of self-harm. And that, can help these guys get the confidence to come out of themselves and say, "I need help.", or, you know, "This is how I'm feeling.". And, and it gets them to open up and gets them to

talk, and gets them thinking. And it's not just, it's not just about, their, offending behaviour or their victim. It's everything, it's about their relationships with their parents, their relationships with their partners, their relationships with their children. Relationships with people in general.

SP7: Um, obviously like that with my partner, like we kind of had like a period where we, kind of like broke up. Um, we've kind of like got together now, but obviously she's told me that she was talking to someone else, she wasn't seeing them, just kind of like, talking. And I've always said well like, you know, if she every met someone else or spoke to someone else I could never like- I'd hate her, you know what I mean, but it's, it's like the opposite kind of thing, and I was even saying that I was kind of shocked that I've dealt with it in the way I have 'cos, I'm pretty sure, before I come to jail, if that had happened, I would have never spoke to her again. But then obviously, I am in prison so the circumstances are a bit different. But yeah that- I'm surprised how I dealt with that differently to what I thought that if, you had asked me like asked me that before it happened... I would have just nev- I would have just said 'That's it, don't ever want to see you again. I hate you.'. Like, even she said herself she's surprised as well 'cos she knows how I am, I'll tend to use things against- I'll use it against her. I dunno like, I'm just- I'm just shocked in myself how I dealed with it, I thought I'd have been very opposite to what I am, but, I'm not so. That's- To me that's like a surprise in myself really... She, she might be going through a hard time . I'm not- Obviously, I'm in prison, she's out there on her own so it might- Talking to someone might just, you know. And I wouldn't really think of it like that before, you know. Before I'd be like- What I can say is the thinking I had before was more selfish thinking.

As mentioned above, staff also identified the need for ongoing support, that TFP was generally aware of such needs and facilitated good communication with institutional support services. The next example shows clearly how TFP facilitators can both challenge and help bring about change:

SS1: Sometimes you're touching on subjects that can, people don't wanna touch on...And when people don't wanna touch on or do something you get resistance. It's quite difficult. But then that comes down to the people that facilitate. And that the people that are running that course is getting the individuals to, breaking down that resistance...Or, seeing that there's resistance there and stepping round it and finding another avenue, to opening the person up... And that's why, you know, you've got some great people working for the charity, that do some, really difficult work to get these guys to open up...Ah, I've seen one incidence where, where there was one guy, he, he really didn't want to talk, he didn't want to get involved, and... He didn't wanna write stuff down. And I was sitting there, and, ah, I knew him, and he came to me, out- He stepped out of the group and came to me and said, "I need to write something down." And it was because he couldn't write. So it's

about that- Knowing that they can turn to someone. But he would never have come to me before and said, "I can't write."... And, and, and that, that was a big shock for me.

Interviewee SS1 also highlighted the need for better knowledge and sensitivity on the wings, particularly when prisoners were participating in TFP programme:

SS1: There are incidents where people, get angry and upset, for nothing. What we would assume is nothing, on the landings. And, sometimes that comes down to the fact that they've been on the Forgiveness course and they've touched some subjects that they didn't want to touch on, and they've come away, maybe a little bit emotional. Um... [pause] But then, that comes down to... [pause] Trying to make people that work here, understand that what goes on in that group, 'cos it is some quite powerful stuff that goes in that room. And when the guys come back, they are quite vulnerable. Some of them are thinking about a lot of things have happened in their lives, a lot of things have upset them, and a lot of things that they've done...And he's now realising the effect that his crime's had. You know, someone said something to me the other day... "How does a rapist know, how his victim feels if no one ever tells him?". And that's what you're dealing with. If you have a victim of a serious crime that's telling, how they felt after that serious crime, you have a perpetrator of a similar crime sitting there. He may start realising what's happened...And what effects his behaviour's had on others. Whereas he may have been too selfish and too blinkered to have realised. And now he's having to deal with that emotion as well as his own emotions. So that can make people, in the short term a bit angry. Angry with themselves, and that comes out in different ways.

When prompted as to how to improve staff knowledge of TFP, interviewees acknowledged the difficulties but did not feel they were insurmountable:

SS1: You can't just have, any officer sitting in on the Forgiveness Project for however long, because the guys that are in the room have got to build up a trust, with everybody that's in that room, and that's why you can't really have different officers or different people sitting around and watching... 'Cos then it becomes almost like a zoo. But there certainly needs to be some- Some sort of, information maybe, ah, you know, a presentation or, some sort of information put out and, make- Just to make people aware of how, vulnerable some of these people could be.

Additionally, a number of staff considered ways to widen the access to and implementation of TFP. For instance, MS3 spoke of how TFP improved overall when it stopped being "hidden" away in psychology. While MS2: suggested incorporating it within education more formally:

... or maybe something that's just kind of rolled out on every timetable, but offered to everyone, and the lads can maybe volunteer to go on it.

M: Okay.

MS2: Erm, (pause) erm, I mean, depending on how it was rolled out, from what you were saying it could be- You could do two courses of

forgiveness project within an education timetable set up. So there's a twelve week timetable, potentially the forgiveness project could be rolled out at least twice throughout that.

SS1:.. I just think it's a brilliant Project, brilliant course. Um, I just wish that more officers were able to have more information about what goes on.

Would they recommend TFP?

When asked directly whether staff would recommend TFP to prisoners and other staff, they were unanimous in saying yes, most indicating that they would "definitely" do so:

MS2: I think it's really good. It's a really good thing to have...Yeah. Yeah, definitely. They get to a point where they stop seeing us as the enemy and they work with us. They realise that they can have, you know, quite a positive relationship with staff.

This recommendation was something that held even when staff interviewees were probed a little more about whether TFP is suitable for all prisoners...

MS3: Erm, I think I would recommend it to all.... Because even if it is for them to look at, who they need to forgive. Like if they have no sort of victim empathy or no remorse or anything I think it can still benefit them, exploring the idea of forgiveness. I guess the only thing I would say is if they're vocally opposed to, the idea of forgiving and being forgiven they might not be great in a group, but...I think everyone could definitely get something from the project regardless of where they're at.

SS2: I would say there aren't many, um, there aren't many obvious exclusions. I really like the fact that it makes sense for people who haven't been convicted as well as people who have. 40% of the population here haven't been convicted. Um, of that 40%, you know, the overwhelming majority have been in trouble with the police before, um, and, ah, you know, the nice thing about Forgiveness is that it's not- You don't have to be a prisoner, um, to understand the issues or potentially benefit from it. Ah, you certainly don't need to know whether you've been convicted and what your sentence is. And a lot of sentence planning, ['forward'/'formal'] sentence planning, does require that, it requires a sentence. And Forgiveness doesn't.

In some cases, staff wanted wider roll out of TFP, to other institutions and interviewee SS3 wanted TFP to both re-brand and become an accredited programme:

SS3: There's got to be, ah, this really needs to get accredited. Alright, so that it can go down to targets for sentence plans, or custody plans, whatever they call them these days. So, that prisoners can have a self-interest in wanting to get on it, um, because you will get prisoners, "Well I'm not doing that. It's not gonna help me parole, help me get my tag.". Alright, and, it- The benefit of this doesn't really hit them until they've started doing it. So they, um, it will be easier to get guys on it who are, ah, parole prisoners. Ah, because they can have that, it's on their sentence plan...or their custody plan, then they can see the benefit. But I

don't think it should be restricted, to them. I think then that, um, more information about the, the- Sometimes I think that the word 'Forgiveness Project' is the wrong name...Because it, it's- Ah, it's, it really is about moving on, really, ah, and I don't know whether they could have called it the Moving On Project... if they called it the Freedom Project, or, um... I dunno, it's very difficult really, I just think that sometimes 'forgiveness' kind of gave it a, a church-y feel, which does put off some prisoners, ah, and it also gave some, it would have given some prisoners- And a lot of them had this impression on the first, that, "Well, you know, I don't really want to forgive this person.". Ah, and it wasn't until they got past that that it's not really you saying, "It's alright that you done this to me.". It's really saying, "You've done this to me, but I'm not going to let it affect me anymore, and I'm moving past that now, you are almost irrelevant to my life now, and I've got over that.

Although, as interviewee SS2 pointed out:

SS2: And, ah, being told that you're going to a programme because the parole board's asked you to go to that programme and you won't be released unless you do. You know, you might not open page one. You might just not open the book, you just do the programme because you've been told to.

SS2 continued later:

SS2: It's one of those programmes where, um, you know, the detail and the quality of it is everything. It's, it's not like I say, the fundamental idea at the centre of it is very simple. If it has an impact, it's, it's because of the quality of the way that it's delivered and its engagement with the people that it's dealing with. Um, and that's, that's quite hard, you can't, you can't write a manual...that says, "This will always work if you deliver it in this way.", because it will only ever work if it's delivered in a good way by inspiring thoughtful knowledgeable people.

M: I mean, I just made a note about that actually and I was going to ask you what your opinion is about how easily it could be made into an accredited programme, or if that's possible?

SS2: I think that's hard...To really do it, because I think it is, it's, as I say it's rooted in the quality of people, it's rooted in their actual experience for its credibility really does rest on being able to say, you know, "We're not telling you about something that we've read about. We're telling you about something that we've lived through." Um, and that's, that's difficult to, ah, to franchise... Um, but I don't know, for example, could you, could you deliver it by showing a video of one of these very inspirational people talking, and then having a discussion about the video? You could try. Would I expect it to, to have as strong an impact? No I really wouldn't. You need the living breathing human being in front of you, um, and it is, you know, striking how prisoners will ask direct, honest, difficult questions, sometimes self-pitying questions, and you need the opportunity for the speaker to come back and say, "Well

actually, you should, you should listen more carefully to what I said. Um, let me say it again." You can't do that with a video.

A slightly different perspective also came through in that staff contrasted the approach of TFP with what they saw as being fairly typical of the accredited programmes they were aware of (something that also came through in prisoner interviews):

SS2: I, I think it [TFP] goes very effectively to, a sort of building self-awareness and awareness of others. Which, you know, in the job is what most of the thinking skills programmes are trying to get to...Uh, but it does it very directly and it does it sort of quite sympathetically. Um, ah, and it takes prisoners by surprise a bit. Um, when you've been doing this for a while you do learn to recognise the language that prisoners use when they've done a fair number of accredited programmes...Which is not to say that those programmes aren't having an impact, but, you know, there is a language that it teaches. They're, they're, often designed to teach that understanding and to express the understanding in a particular way. Ah, the Forgiveness doesn't really do that, ah, because it's storytelling, because it's so direct, ah, I think it can have an emotional impact which probably gets prisoners thinking more rather more honestly and quickly than some of the more traditional programmes.

The young offenders were also positive overall about TFP. The interchange below shows that MP6 too, would recommend it, although maybe not to everyone. The exchange begins in response to a question as to whether MP6 wanted to add anything to his responses thus far:

MP6: No I just, I just- About the forgiveness project it's a really good project, and people should do it. Sensible people who actually want to change their lives, they should do it. To like for their eyes to open up and they, for them to actually realise there is, other prospects to life than crime, or just doing bad stuff, you know what I mean. Just, just really just become a sensible person and realise your mistake and learn from your mistake. And don't make that mistake again.

M: Erm, and just one little thing. You said there that only sensible people should do it. Do you think there's certain people who would benefit more than others?

MP6: People that can actually like tell that they regret what they've done. They should do it, rather than some people who, like that little idiot ginger kid. He just talk a lot of rubbish 'ah, one of you, one of you lot's a policeman here'....Mate, why they gonna have policeman in jail? First of all. Second of all, you know, you know what I mean the screws are here. What are they here for? They're here to protect you. All that's gonna happen is just stupid, stupid things, just puts everyone off. Know what I mean, so I think everyone should be there, people who wanna do it should be there, rather than people who don't wanna do it. They're just gonna muck about, and just, disturb everyone else.

When considering the long term impact of TFP, one officer mentioned that it would be useful to be able to follow up on prisoners who had been through the programme:

SS3: It would be nice if, he's got over the eight years to do in here, I can at some point refer back and say, "That _____, did he ever come back into jail?". You know, you know, and sort of really nice if there is some sort of follow up. Which I think there probably is, isn't there? There's something to do where they are. 'Cos I know _____ [officer-facilitator mentioned earlier] is now involved with the Forgiveness Project outside of the Forgiveness Project, so obviously that's going to continue out there, and I'd hope that there would be some feedback on the outside groups back in to inside to say, "You know that guy who came through your groups, yeah, well, he's doing really well outside, he's got a job", because that would help people in here who had put some effort into it, and make them feel as if they've actually done something good.

Having already noted that it is difficult to predict change post release whilst a person is still incarcerated, interviewee SS2, continued:

SS2: ...we shouldn't be surprised that re-offending rates are high and it's difficult to change, because you've got to have the coincidence of a lot of external factors and some pretty important internal factors coming together...to bring forward the moment at which somebody stops committing crime, you know, that's what it's about. I mean, I mean I wouldn't have continued to support Forgiveness if I didn't think that, it was contributing significantly to that. And, um, I'm going to be very interested in the results of your work, if it- It's going to be difficult of course to establish that, ah, as a matter of absolute fact. But again it says a lot for the Forgiveness Project that they're prepared to ask those questions. It is by far the most striking and endearing thing about the organisation, is that it never ever shies away from a difficult question, where you might, be made really uncomfortable by the answer.

The same interviewee also raised issues of resourcing and the sustainability of TFP's interventions.

SS2: Ah, um, it's hugely helpful that- Especially in the early stages, you know, we were getting Forgiveness for free, we now contribute, um, some but nowhere near the full cost of it. And that's given us the freedom to do something which is, is more innovative, um, and I really hope, I hope you(r) evaluation produces positive outcomes and I hope Forgiveness are able to use the successful relationship here to, to work elsewhere and to expand more. And they have done, to some extent, and we weren't the first place they came. But there is a, um, you know, there's an equal and opposite responsibility on the prison not to be sort of, quixotic in its relationship with organisations like Forgiveness....Um, it's terribly easy to say, "It's inconvenient to do this this month.", or, you know, "We've run out of money.", or, "Actually it's just [sharp intake of breath], you know, we've got too much on.". Ah, but the value of doing it

is, grows with the relationships that last for long for trust and so on to build up.

M: Hm. Is it hard sometimes achieving that, that balance and sort of maintaining that relationship?

SS2: Yeah, it is. And the people in the prison who do all the leg work...to make the programme a success work fantastically hard, at doing it. Um, I'm sure you have spoken to them. They, they wouldn't be doing it...if they didn't get a buzz from the outcomes. You know, you wouldn't put in this much effort, and it's generally well above and beyond what they're paid for. Um, they're doing that because, they feel instinctively that it's a good thing and making a difference...and doing it with real commitment and passion.

6.3 Retrospective Interviews

HMP Jupiter

In this section we turn to data taken from interviews conducted at HMP Jupiter. As the source for retrospective assessment of the impact of TFP, this sample provides a useful counterpoint to the narrative presented thus far.

Overall views were again overwhelmingly positive and prisoners were all referred to TFP on a voluntary basis after they had completed the prison's own victim awareness intervention. There were some differences, most notably in terms of a more cautious appraisal of whether they were likely to return to prison after their current sentence had finished, although again, there was some optimism about employment.

JP3:... I think I've probably been more expansive than I usually am! But I really do, I really do believe in the Forgiveness Project. And I don't know if it's come across, I'm not a great believer in courses and, and....But...for me, on a very personal note. What I took masses of, masses of amounts from it...And, I think that's down to not only its structure, but its staff...You know, I think, I honestly do think they're a wonderful group of people. And the way, the way, the way they go about doing what they're trying to do. I think they've got spot on...You know, and, I will always- And it's funny 'cos I've never been that way and I probably never will be at any, anything else! But that is one group's corner I will always fight. Do you know what I mean. I really got nothing but great respect for 'em.

JP2: Er, found out about it, I was put onto a BVA course. Er, Become Victim Awareness course within the prison, um. And initially I had to do it part of my sentence plan, so it was compulsory for me and, after I done the BVA I was asked- It was a voluntary thing anyway...

JP3: And, in this prison, um, once you've completed, ah, Becoming Victim Aware course...you're offered, the Forgiveness Project...It's not compulsory, um, I mean BVA is usually part of a sentence plan, which is pretty well compulsory. But, the

Forgiveness Project, um, is generally offered to those that have done, BVA, um, and it's your decision whether you want to go on it or not.

JP1: Um. [clears throat] I did victim awareness here and um, that's when they told me um, they run like a forgiveness project and I thought it would be ideal because I was- In the courts they was always talking about, er, 'how would you feel about meeting your victim?'.

JP2: This is my first prison sentence, um, um, doing the courses I'm slowly sort of rela- Relaxing, into the prison way, um, I'm able to deal with things, when they happen, if they happen. Um, with TFP, you know what I mean, it, it, changed everything straight away, yeah, I was able to let go of everything straight away and I'm quite relaxed now. I mean, I'm able to deal with things and I've learned that I c- If I'm angry outside I'm gonna end up back inside prison.

JP2: Um, ideally I would- Paid work. That's what I want to do as soon as I get out, but, um, I've sort of trained up while I've been in prison with horticulture, plants section, um, that's the sort of area I'd like to go into, landscaping, things like that. But ideally, paid work as soon as I get out. And then sort of, like start from there.

How likely is it that they will be re-incarcerated?

JP1: No. Not, as in me going out causing crime, no. But you can never say never. Because the, parole board asked me the same thing. And I said to them truthfully. They said to me 'do you reckon you'll end up in prison again?'. I said 'never say never, but I'm not going to go out there and cause, commit crime, the only thing probably land me back inside jail is probably defending myself and someone says that I've hit them because- Check this scenario right. I a pub, if a geezer comes over and hits me, and I've hit him, to defend myself.

JP2: Um, alcohol being a main factor. 'Cos it's freely available outside, um, that is, that is, one of the main challenges I have got.

Previous Expectations, Motivations and First Assessments

As in the other institutions, although TFP was generally recommended to prisoners, they were very uncertain about how it worked or what it did, beforehand. When they found out, all were effusive.

JP4: It- At first- Like, I'm IPP so I've done a lot of victim empathy stuff and... I did find it hard to ask someone for, for forgiveness... That's, that's why she said, "Oh, why don't you do this course?". And I was a bit like, a bit taken aback like, "Why should I have to ask for forgiveness? At the end of the day if I'm sorry for what I've done then...that should be enough.". But she actually explained a bit more about it, then I took it on board and just said "Okay, I'll give it a go."... 'Cos I, 'cos I, ah, well I killed somebody, and that person wasn't there for me to ask for

forgiveness, it was like hindsight made me think about it a bit more and, if I could get it through by doing this course, I thought, "Okay, get a bit of forgiveness that way. I'll just take on board other peoples' perspective on forgiveness." You know what I mean?

JP2: Um, my expectat- Well, it, it seems like every course you go in, you feel like it's going to be, er, a bunch of lads sitting around, all discussing, past experiences, why did you get in trouble. The, the norm really...But, um, when I actually got onto the course it was completely different.

JP1: I didn't think it would be as real as it was. I just thought it was going to be some people coming with a sob story...Like, it was totally different when I got on it.

JP3: I went in, quite closed minded...Um, as in, "Another course, I'll give it a morning, and ah, you know, dinner time break I'll make an evaluation, and see whether I want to continue it or not..Um, first morning kind of blew me away...

Again, family was a strong motivation for joining the group and incentive to change:

JP1:... Two daughters, and erm. Yeah, like, my, my ambition is just to get out there and be a good role model for them, I want them to look up to me and say, 'yeah, my dad's good', know what I mean. So that, that's really my goal, my drive. I do all this for them. As well as, you know, definitely for myself, but mostly for them.

JP2: My motivation is my family...Cos I can't afford to let my fam- I can't afford to let my family down again. It won't be just my family but myself. It will be people in here as well who have taken the time to help...Facilitators...people, like other prisoners as well.

Most Impact

Again, the speakers and the facilitators were highly appreciated:

JP1: She, her daughter was murdered, from stabbing. [clears throat] And, you know, the girl was from my area, so I was quickly inv- You know, involved, listening and all that. She's saying she's writing to this girl now who killed her daughter and I, I was just amazed like how she, was able to do such a thing, innit, and that's got me, really involved.

JP4: When I first met her and she told me her story and, I was intrigued by it and I wanted to know more, that's why I stayed on there and done it, because of that woman 'pecifically, because she, she went through a lot, and she still forgive somebody so I was like... It's not... The way I grew up it's not easy to ask for forgiveness because some of the things that you had to do as growing up, you don't get, ah, that chance. And what she- She'd been through worse than what I'd been through. And she still forgive [inaudible - 'them both?'], so it's like, there is a thin line

*between being able to forgive and that, know what I mean, so her-
It was more so her, when I sat down and listened to her, _____.*

Additionally, the importance of the way TFP developed, letting participants take the lead on their own involvement and the cell based work also came through quite clearly:

JP2: Yeah, yeah well obviously we got, we got a pack, like a work pack that we done, um, each day we done, over the course of the three days, we done worksheets...regarding that day what, what we should take away from it. But also we done like additional things, sort of like, a bit of um, it was like a sort of timeline, sort of writing. Where we got like a, A5 piece of paper, sort of started from the beginning to the point we are now.

M: A life history?

JP2: Life history, yeah. And, I was amazed I could actually do something like that.

[]

M: And what was it like standing up- Did you stand up and present it?

JP2: Yeah we did... Um, nerve-wracking at first, but I think once, once you get going, know what I mean, it starts flowing, that's it. And obviously you know what they've done is like they didn't jump us straight in at the deep end with that saying that you've got to do this first day. They, they sort of settled it in to sort of the second day to the third day. And then, done it then. So we were comfortable with the people we were with, and um...

M: So like the structure of the course, was, good in that way, kind of eased you in?

JP2: Yeah, yeah, yeah. [overlapping] I think the structure was brilliant and I'd recommend it to anyone.

JP4:...Rather than writing it down and- I'm dyslexic so it's like sometimes a lot of paperwork for me is a bit like... Gets bored of it. But where.... _____ got into my head it was more mental like and it was so engulfed. I even ended up going and getting a book that her and her husband had written and that. So it got into my head more than being written down, doing lots of paperwork.

Importance of the Group

When reflecting back on the influence of TFP's intervention, it seemed clear to most of these participants that the group formed at the workshop was itself very important. This had been recognised in the interviews at HMP&YOI Mercury (where "clowns" were also acknowledged) and at HMP Saturn, in both cases by staff and some prisoners but in these interviews, it was something that more clearly came through as important.

JP2: We- We're all different in there, and I think we're all from different backgrounds, from different races, and ah, to be able to bond with other lads that I've never met before, complete strangers...That's, that's part of a group thing, that was good, and obviously from where the sort of tutors were coming from, they were giving us feedback as well regarding, um, the way sort of speaking to each other, and, like I find that was of great help...

JP1: The group I was on, it was alright, but we did have a few clowns on there...Obviously there was a few immature people who wasn't taking the course seriously. I find, it frustrates me a little bit, you know.

Phenomenological Point of Interest: Connection and isolation

Staff and prisoners often reported practical benefits of the groups, such as prisoners challenging and teaching each other, frequently more effectively than a member of staff would have engaged them. Beyond this, prisoners formed tentative social bonds with one another that they might not have done otherwise:

JP2: We- We're all different in there, and I think we're all from different backgrounds, from different races, and ah, to be able to bond with other lads that I've never met before, complete strangers...That's, that's part of a group thing, that was good

That this kind of socialisation was unusual enough to comment on, suggests that it is in contrast to daily prison life which would be better characterised by its relative isolation and guardedness, which could extend to carefully defined, rigid social groups separated by things such as ethnicity, age, or offence type.

M: Okay, and did it affect the group as a whole do you think?

JP1: Nah, everyone kept their focus, everyone... The clowns they just... You don't really pay attention to them, you know what I mean, but, but overall the group was a serious group. Yeah, it's definitely for people who wanna listen, not for people who are just doing it to say 'yeah, I've

done it', you know what I mean.

JP4: Yeah, 'cos people were starting to drop out where they're saying it wasn't for them, and things like that, so then we ended up with a good few people there. And then it was yeah it was much better...The idiots were gone, wasn't it. So people were more, more open to what she was saying and listening and interacting a bit more so yeah, yeah it was quite good, it turned out to be quite good.

JP2: Like, each and everyone has got their own way of dealing with things. And you do take- I think, I think the actual teachers were the people themselves...Us, if you know what I mean...Um, they the teach- The actual facilitators were there to guide us, sort of like feed us little bits of information here and there, but the people who were sort of running it were the actual prisoners who were there at the time.

JP3:... I been in this jail two years. I could do a course with somebody that's been in this jail two years and I've never met that person, I've never spoken to them, and I probably never will again...When that course 'as finished. Because we, we, both told we got to do this course, we're doing it at the same time. It's a regimented course so we're focused on the course..Not each other... Whereas the Forgiveness Project it, it involves you all. You become a group rather than a.. A class.

Phenomenological Point of Interest: Group identity, inter-subjectivity and empathy

The figure of the 'clown' – or disruptive prisoner who is wilfully disengaged, appears to be unambiguously negative. However, in looking more closely at the ways in which prisoners who did engage with the project describe the attitudes and conduct of the 'clowns', it would appear that, for prisoners who committed to the project, the initial disruptive presence of the clowns served an important categorical function in establishing their own identities as 'serious' and committed group members. This inter-subjective sense of 'groupness' also appears to be facilitated by the voluntary nature of the group (which also marks the clowns as 'temporary' members – who may return if, or when they are 'ready'). The shared group identity of prisoners participating in the forgiveness project is arguably a key resource that augments the psychosocial benefits of the project. The lack of visible psychological professionals and assessments, and the prominence of 'ordinary people's stories' seemed to cement this as a uniquely valuable and powerful group environment for many prisoners:

JP1: Because, it was real. And like, normally [clears throat] with these courses it's just like people teaching it from a bit of card and there's like people, people coming in, voluntary, to tell you about their experiences, and tell you about how they feel. And they ain't done no courses to tell them what to say to us, I think it's just, come from the heart.

The 'real' and voluntary accounts of 'ordinary people' appeared to assist in creating empathic connections. Some compared the victims to their mothers or other family members. This shift in categories used to conceptualise the consequences of their actions – from abstract 'victim' to concrete familial and personal figures – was also powerful in terms of how prisoners reported being able to 'think about the wider picture' in terms of the impact of their actions:

MP6:... I'd just say 'think'. I, I'll like think about my actions now. And just think about like, the wider picture, who, who else am I going to affect, 'cos at first I'm just thinking 'yeah, I'm just going to affect myself'. No, you affect your community, most of all you affect your family.

SP7: I feel a lot more remorse for the person, 'cos I know, now looking back on it, that, you know, I could have prevented someone from, probably, he's probably affected now so if I knew these things before then maybe it could have helped him from being affected 'cos I'm pretty sure he's still affected, you know like, 'cos of that course, if you- If I look on things from the course, the forgiveness project thing, I can see that, it's affected him a lot more than I ever thought, or any of my co-Ds would think.

In phenomenological terms, this marks a movement from an insular, hostile and defensive subjectivity to a more consciously inter-subjective sense of self in relation to others. This approach to 'assessing' changes in prisoners' empathy arguably gives us a level of insight that the quantitative measures could not demonstrate.

Comparisons with Other Interventions

These participants also clearly contrasted TFP with accredited programmes that they had been on, both before and after TFP:

JP2: With any other course, you look at a board, you write stuff down, that's it, it goes straight into a book and then that's it. With TFP, you sort of run the show...And, with that you're taking stuff away because you're, you're, you're sort of putting the input.

JP1: Nah, forgiveness project is definitely top.

JP1: It's totally, totally different than any, um, how can I put it, structured course...It's quite, it's more about the pupil than the teacher, where most courses are- They, they, they've got a set curriculum, I will teach you part A, part B, part C, part D. You will do an exam when you have got to part B, you know... And its very informality I think is its greatest strength.

JP2:...and the people who were there as well. So I think TFP sort of does dig deep with your, with your emotions, and, you can speak freely because it will stay there, and it won't go into the prison, if you know what I mean.

JP2: Again, like with, with BVA you're in a classroom with, 12 other lads and you get given a folder and you just collect paper...And you write on the paper now and then. With TFP you get a small booklet, which you put a small amount into. The most amount goes into your brain, know what I mean. That's what- That's the key of taking things away. Know what I mean, a bit of paper would just get thrown to the back of the cupboard and that...

JP3: There was no pres- There's no pressure. At all, from, from the minute you enter you're told, "Listen, if this isn't for you, put your hand in the air and say, 'This isn't for me.'". There will be no written report sent, 'didn't attend', you know, 'didn't function'. And in prison that's a big thing for us, is paperwork. We need certain bits of paper to be ticked to say, 'he attended', 'he interacted'. Because obviously, you know, those bits of paper, to us as prisoners it's about getting out. And those bits of paper, lots of bits of paper determine- Can determine whether you, when you get out, you know, whether you get home leaves, whether you get tags. Whereas, there's none of that with the Forgiveness Project.

They also compared the facilitators to the psychologists and other staff running accredited programmes:

JP1: Because, it was real. And like, normally [clears throat] with these courses it's just like people teaching it from a bit of card and there's like people, people coming in, voluntary, to tell you about their experiences, and tell you about how they feel. And they ain't done no courses to tell them what to say to us, I think it's just, come from the heart.

JP4:... I'll be blunt, there wasn't any psychology on there or anything like trying to scrutinise sometimes. And people feel more uptight, especially when there's psycholo- Like, psychology around them..Because they think they're trying to be psycho-analysing them and things like that. So it's more of a relaxed atmosphere to it, so yeah, it was, it was good.

Victim Awareness

Given the means of referral at HMP Jupiter, it may not be surprising that victim awareness was so prominent within the interviews there, but it is worth noting how clearly prisoners spoke about the victims of their crimes.

JP1: ...and it makes you look, and think about, my victims. You know, 'cos obviously they said they [speakers] were traumatised, depressed, and all that and I'm thinking, 'maybe I've done the same to mine'.

M: Mm. Okay. And that was something you hadn't thought about before, or...?

JP1: Yeah, I have thought about it, but you know like when it's in your face like that [clears throat] and you've got these people here, explaining about what they've been through, and they're crying, and they're getting you right involved with what they're saying, and you're so focused in. You put deeper thoughts, you know, 'what have I done to my victims?'. It makes you think about it more deeply I think.

Changes in Behaviours and Approaches

The men did clearly speak of changing their approaches but again, this was not necessarily about wanting to change who they were, rather, to change their approach:

JP3: [pause] I never really wanted to change. I'm quite happy being me... Um, [pause]. But there were certain things in my life that I, I could never accept. Um, there's certain things in everybody's life, you know, there's certain things in if you look back in your life you think, "Why me?"...It gave me the ability to, to, to, to accept that it was not personal. That's just life, that's just growing up. Bad happens, good happens. Don't get hung up on it.

M: Don't take things personally?

JP3: Yeah. Just get over it. Don't- It's- That's just the way it is. Bad happens to everyone. Good happens to everyone. You know what I mean, that's the way it is.

JP1: If I was that person now, I probably wouldn't be here talking to ya...I'd be probably in a block. You know what I mean, I'd probably be kicking off a fuss, over minor shit. I mean, my first year in prison, it was hectic, always fighting over minor stuff. Like 'this person owes me a pack of biscuits, right I've got to go punch him up, 'cos he didn't pay me on time, I've got to go hit him, 'cos if I don't hit him it makes me look like an, like an idiot in front of everyone else and I can't have that'. You know, just, weak minded, you know what I mean. And I just, grew out of that and I was thinking, 'what the fuck was I thinking'. So yeah, definitely I'm more mature. I'm a man now, so. It's good.

JP4: [inaudible] It's like, it's like if I slapped you. And said "Do you forgive me for that?". Really I don't really mean it, it's just trying to get myself out of shit with you...But if, if I slapped you and then come to try and make sure you was okay and then, looked into myself and, "Oh, I really shouldn't have done that.". And then made sure you was okay, not to try and get myself out of trouble, but because I'm asking you for forgiveness for slapping you.... ____ [speaker] showed me that, because anybody can ask for forgiveness, but do you really mean it? As in do you

really, really be forgiven for some action that you done when really you don't, you don't consider the action that you've done a bad action. Can you see what I mean?

JP3: It's come slowly from the Forgiveness Project. You know, obviously you don't wake up. You don't do a course Friday, wake up Monday morning and, everything's changed, you're suddenly a believer...Um, but it's... It's, it seeps into, without even realising, it seeps into you.

Again, participants spoke of thinking more before taking decisions and of better managing their anger.

JP2: Oh, I would tell 'em, I would tell 'em that from my experience it was deep. That you do open up a lot of gates and doors, you know, regarding your history and ah, how you feel at the time. Um. Sort of, admit to your feelings as well, where, I was always- All my problems I was sucking em in...To the point where I'd break, break up one day and that was it. I'd explode sort of thing, and, I feel with the TFP I was able to sort of, let go of my feelings and sort of, speak freely.

JP1: Yeah, because normally if something's happened you just quickly label it straight away, don't ya? It's- It's a normal reaction. I quickly do that but then I think about, you know, 'why's this person done that?', 'what's caused this?'. You know what I mean, then break it down like that...Yeah, and in a way it's kind of helped 'cos instead of just being, you know, pissed off, as it was, angry, you know, you can actually break it down for yourself. And just find out what, what's going on, before, you know, actually labelling this person, doing something about it.

[]

M: Okay, right. Is that- Have you used it in here, kind of situations...?

JP1: Yeah, little things happen, you know, people nicking out your cell. You know, I've had people nicking out my cell before only a bit of- A bit of tobacco but, you know I, straight away my first reaction was 'fucking tea leaf, criminal'. And then next thing I'm thinking 'hang on, why's the person doing it, I mean is the person stealing off me so they could go buy drugs? Is someone getting bullied to do it? You know, maybe it ain't their fault, maybe they're getting forced to do it'. [clears throat] You know, and after, when I thought about it I was thinking 'it's only a bit of burn at the end of the day, it's nothing'...Yeah, 'cos, in prison, at the beginning I'd take a lot of things personally, I'd hold grudges. If like, if you've upset me then I won't talk to ya...But now, just look at the bigger picture, you know.

Here too, participants identified their families as part of their changing approach.

JP4: [pause] I was quite violent and, that's gone now, I'm just, not interested in it. Obviously I get upset with certain things, or about things

but, I can control it a bit better now before I would have just lashed out. Now I just- Like water off a duck's back now, I'm just bored with it.

M: And why is that changed?

JP4: Nothing to prove...I've got nothing to prove to no one in here. That's how I look at it

M: Who, or what made you realise that?

JP4: It was my Ma...She, she give a clip on a visit, like, "Why are you still fighting? You've got nothing to prove.". But we were in my local, in my local jail which was back in area, and there was people that were coming in that most probably owed me things, or we had beef on the street, and they'd see me, I'd see them and we'd have a fight, things like that, so. It was like, "You're in jail now, what have you- There's nothing- You ain't, you ain't involved in anything else, why are you still-?". She couldn't comprehend it...And I said, "It's my reputation I got to keep up.". She's like, "You're looking at a life sentence, what reputation's that?"...She was right, it hit home.

JP3: I see this as- You know, certain things we spoke about are again to do with face. I'd never tell anyone that this happened to me because, it's, it's not right. Do you know what I mean, as a criminal and as a whatever, this isn't something I would admit to because it might make me seem smaller.

M: Is that the way you thought, in the past?

JP3: Yeah. You know, it's, it's quite an amazing thing really.

M: And where- What point did that change, when you came to prison, or was it after Forgiveness Project?

JP3: After the, during the Forgiveness Project... [] I suppose it... It's made me less confrontational, more relaxed in the way I deal, not just with my life, but the way things interact with my life...You know, it's- I don't see everything so personal anymore.

As the last excerpt illustrates, and echoing the

Phenomenological Point of Interest: Powerlessness, empowerment and agency

One of the distinctive features of TFP that was repeatedly emphasised by both prisoners and staff was the way in which it promoted input from group members, without being overly directive or patronising. This facilitation of personal agency was reflected strongly in some participants' comments about what they took away from the workshops:

JP2: Life history, yeah. And, I was amazed I could actually do something like that.

Explicit contrasts were made by both staff and prisoners between TFP and other prison based interventions such as ETS (Enhanced Thinking Skills). Whilst few were entirely dismissive and most saw some value in these accredited programmes, they were described as being far more rigid and proscriptive than TFP. Inter-subjectivity and identity are again both relevant here, with many participants' experiences of the workshops suggesting a highly flexible approach that was client centred. This was in sharp contrast with the didactic approach perceived as characteristic of other interventions:

JP1: It's totally, totally different than any, um, how can I put it, structured course...It's quite, it's more about the pupil than the teacher, where most courses are- They, they, they've got a set curriculum, I will teach you part A, part B, part C, part D.

There is therefore a strong theme of empowerment arising out of participation in TFP. Additionally, it was suggested that such agency and autonomy were lacking in the prisoners' and offenders' lives as a whole, both inside and outside prison, although this contrast was not drawn out as clearly.

earlier interviews, prisoners spoke of the roles they played within the prison culture and how difficult it was to step out of those characters, both for prisoners and officers.

JP3: You know, in here, it's very much about face... Um, there's none of that with them. Even, I can't think of his name at the moment, but the prison officer who worked there, there is- Between prisoners and prison officers there is a divide. There always will be, because one is doing a job and one is here and don't want to be here. But even- I can't think of his name now. You stopped seeing him as a prison officer, he became a person. Which is a very rare thing in jail. We see, it's a uniform. Um, and, and that's a big thing. They dress in civvies.... But with this because there is no- There was no- He's not from this jail, he no longer became a prison officer. He became, just another member of the group.

JP1: Well, in there, it's it's survival, y'know what I mean. Even though like I did a few courses in there. At the back of my mind I'm still thinking 'I've still got to defend myself, and I've still got to-'. Got to be this, this, erm, character. If you take on a certain role, you've got to act this certain way. Like a police officer, he's got to act a certain way, like assertive person. He may not be assertive at home, but he's putting on that role because he's got to wear that badge. Like in _____ [previous prison] it was the same sort of situation. I've got to put on this thing and let people know, that you can't push me around. But the same time, I'm trying to do something positive with my life so leave me alone. you know what I mean. So, but these courses, that I've done now, and like where I've grown up and more, I'm able to like serve out my, um, go with the flow, just mixing in. It is what it is. Just step back and 'you know what, I don't wanna be a part of that'. I can just walk away, from certain people, who I say are my friends, who I know they're getting up to no good. But I can say, 'you know what, you do what you want to do, I'm, I'm doing what I'm doing over here. We can be friends, but just don't involve me with what you're doing.'. And that's that's something definitely I got out of _____ [previous prison] because in there, it's always peer pressure, peer pressure, peer pressure. And then like, you just get to a certain point where you're like 'no, I'm not having it'. And, these courses, help you a little bit just to break it down, because I've not, I'm not big on words, right, and um, it's sometimes, I found it hard, hard to like break it down to people, to explain myself, 'look, I wanna be, I wanna be your mate still, but I don't wanna be a part of what you're doing'.

JP2: Know what- Staff give you support that you need. Obviously they're there- They're there for a reason, they're not just there- I mean they're not just keys on legs, know what I mean...A lot of them have give- Have taken the time to help. There's one officer who's tried to get me into a voluntary placement, obviously it

hasn't come through because of certain reasons, but um, nah he's bent over backwards for me. I told him that he takes too much on, and he knows that, ah. But um, I feel, I feel, if it weren't for the officers I would be still on a, on a wing doing bugger all really.

When asked directly if they felt that changes in their approach would be sustained after release, participants were cautiously hopeful:

JP1: Definitely...Because, it's helped me get through my sentence a little bit. So it will definitely have a big effect [clears throat] for when I'm released because out there there's a lot more temptation, there's a lot more going on around ya, so, the more I put into practice the more it becomes second nature to me. And you just- I'll just do it without thinking, without having to say 'oh yeah, I did that'. It'll just become normal.

JP3: ..you know, I don't have an electric bill to pay every month, or every quarterly or gas bill, or my insurance on my car, um, clothes for my kids. I don't have those worries at the moment. So, you know, it's still difficult, to say, you know, when all of a sudden I'm out on the street and those, I'm confronted by those again, have I changed enough to say, "Well, we'll, we'll make do. We'll, there will be a way, we'll find a way.". So, you know, I like to think I have...But the test comes obviously....when it's in my face.

M: And what are some of the things you might try to draw on to help you to deal with those extra challenges, like outside?

JP3: Again, you know, a lot of it's inner, a layer of comfortability. My kids don't no longer have to, have the latest Nike trainers on, or the latest iPad Smartphone computer to take to school, that I don't have to be working, I don't have to have two, three hundred pound in my pocket every day, to be comfortable. 'Cos enough people in this world that live without, a millionth of what I've had.

M: So a change in your priorities?

JP3: Yeah. And being comfortable, you know, and accepting the fact that it's okay.

Association with Subsequent Decisions

Prisoners had again taken part in other programmes after completing TFP.

JP1: I did... Ooh, bloody hell, I done so many! I did TSP long ago, about, four months ago. And that's been taken over from ETS I think...The most memorable ones. Well the ones I've done in here there's [inaudible - 'a stop the violent act?'], become- That's it, become victim aware, and then victim awareness. Erm, bloody hell. What other ones currently run? He [staff member in education/programmes] runs all sorts up there. But it's good. Well, that's about it off the top of my head.

JP2: Um, [overlapping] I've done like horticulture diplomas and um, customer care service stuff like that, that's sort of work,

related...Um, more like, emotional ones would be like assertiveness. Er, Becoming Victim Aware, um, I do- I recently applied for, TSP which is Thinking Skills Programme and they stated I was not high of a risk...

They also felt that it had helped them find other ways to contribute more positively:

JP1: I feel great. Because... In a way it's inspired me because I've actually, erm, put in to do voluntary work at probation...You know, where I like go round help young youths and all that. So- [clears throat] And also I like wanted to, um, see my victim, you know, do- You know, because it happens somewhere, don't know where but, you know, to explain why, what I did and why I did it, and like, then so I can apologise, y'know what I mean, just makes you think about your life, what you're doing. How, how it affects other people.

M: And why is it important to you to have that chance to apologise?

JP1: Just to show like, I ain't the same man as I was then. And also just like, maybe [clears throat] I can make that person who I did the crime against, maybe better, maybe give them some closure, you know let them ask me why. Because, I don't know, because obviously I scarred my victim down the face. So I know he's going to remember what happened every day.

[]

JP1: Well... I contacted my old probation officer. And he's like already setting it up for me, And basically we're just- He's just waiting for me to- Or, maybe when I get a D-Cat. 'Cos he, he, he's known me since I was a boy. I was a little terror. So he, he, he's seen a lot of change in me, he's definitely said 'right, yeah, I do want you on the team. There's some voluntary work, do a course...', I was like 'yeah, sweet'. So, I got positive things lined up, 'cos in reality I know I'm not going to get employed straight away, I know I'd be very lucky, so in a way, it's keeping me focused, and I'm doing something positive with me life, and it's something that I like to do.

As before though, it is important to note that the participants did not say that TFP was the sole influence on them during their sentence:

JP3: Yeah, I [overlapping] I'm- I'm a lot easier, do you know what I mean, it's kind of, a lot more things are water off a duck's back. But I'm not sure, you know, a lot of that's come from the Forgiveness Project. But I think some of that's also come with age, you know, 'cos I'm middle-aged now, you know, I'm getting to that point where I don't feel I have to prove myself any more...And, um... [pause] I'm just a lot more comfortable in myself.

JP1: yeah I'm definitely more able, more aware of myself, more aware of my emotions, my feelings, you know, and how to control them. Definitely since being in this prison.

M: And you say partly that's the environment, and you've just grown up yourself...

JP1: Yeah.

M: Do you think the courses have contributed?

JP1: Yeah. Yeah, I, definitely. I mean like, it's all good doing a course but it's all, all about facilitators and, and the prisoners themselves. I mean like, 'cos if you get- Say you had a line full of prisoners, yeah, and they was just you...And all these prisoners sort of sitting there and like 'whatever'. No one's going to know shit, no one's going to be interested, it's just going to be a hard day's work.

Should TFP be mandatory?

Although not asked directly, a number of these participants again considered whether TFP should be implemented as part of a sentence plan and whether attendance should be voluntary or not:

JP1: There's something like, I think it should be... Put to everyone. I think every, every prisoner with a victim, should go on that course. Must go on the course. Should be part of their sentence plan. Because, er, victim- Er, forgiveness project is a voluntary course. So people can just go on there voluntarily, but like I think like in a way yeah, I don't wanna say, put it on someone, 'look, you got to go on this course'. But at the same time, maybe some people need that little extra push just to, you know, get them on the course. Some people just scared to be on the course, don't want to hear about victims and all that because it makes them feel bad inside for what they've done. So I think it should be part of people's sentence plan and that. You know [inaudible].

JP3: Um, I mean they have to be, this isn't an university, we can't come and go as we please. Um, and a lot of courses run in jail you don't- Because of- We have a thing called a sentence plan...When we come to jail, they say, "Right, you've committed X amount of crimes, so you will do certain courses that are supposedly tailored to your offending behaviour...Um, you don't really have a lot of choice whether you do them or not. I mean you, you have a choice obviously, everybody has a choice, but there will be negative...consequences, as in reports, you know, how you progress through the prison will, will be tailored by whether you do these courses or not. Um, and so a lot of people are on courses, they don't really wanna be on the courses...but have to be there, so it's lip service...But the Forgiveness Project is a total voluntary, there is, there is no "You have to do this.". It's a case of "Come along, do the first morning, and if you like it, crack on with it. If you don't, just say, 'No, this isn't for me.'". And you get that feeling right from the start that it won't be held against you. If it's not for you then it's not for you.

6.4 Outlier Cases and Welfare Concerns

At the end of section 6.1, two significant findings about prisoner welfare were highlighted; with concerning scores in the General Health Questionnaire at Time 1 and on the State Anxiety measure at Time 2. In each case, this statistically significant finding could be considered as a manifestation of the “outlier effect”. Outliers are people whose scores on a scale deviate significantly from the norm and if their data are excluded, statistical significance of a measure used will vary. In this case, however, we did not feel it ethical, or appropriate to remove statistical outliers as they are directly relevant to the aims and intentions of this evaluation. Essentially, these significant findings flag up the potential vulnerabilities of the population with whom TFP are working and highlight the additional needs that should be addressed as part of the implementation of TFP and indeed as part of the evaluation process. In this section, we will therefore consider both how we as researchers, dealt with such cases and illustrate how TFP and the institutions’ procedures did seem to be working well.

During all but one interview conducted, participants did not show any obvious signs of distress. The one time that a participant did appear clearly upset was during an interview at T3 with a research participant. When asked if he was happy to continue, he responded that he was, however a decision was eventually made to curtail the interview, as it was not thought to be in his interests to continue. The extra time available through curtailment was used for a lengthy debrief. It had emerged during the interview that he had been dealing with ongoing distressing personal issues, and had come directly from an important meeting with other prison staff that related to these issues. Some of his responses to questionnaire items also raised concerns regarding self-harm. As soon as the debrief had been completed, prison staff were notified and a message was immediately passed to wing officers informing them of the situation.

There were a low number of additional cases where participants showed more subtle signs of distress, or did not show any obvious signs in how they presented themselves during the interview but did provide concerning responses regarding self-harm or depression on the scales that we implemented. In these cases, staff were also notified so that appropriate care and monitoring could be provided⁷. A great deal of care was also taken during debrief with these participants, to check whether they had any concerns that they wished to share, to establish what help and support they were currently accessing, and to encourage them to speak to officers, listeners, or health care staff as appropriate. In the majority of cases, participants were already accessing the relevant and appropriate services (such as health care and in-reach teams). Where concerns were passed on, this was always discussed with the participants first, and in all cases they fully understood the reasons for this. In most cases the specific responses to the self-harm section of the GHQ (and in some cases the items relating to PTSD and trauma) were shared with staff. This was done even when participants stated that they were already engaging with appropriate services.

Each time, we found that both TFP and the institution were responding appropriately. This general experience--that people who presented additional risks were being referred on as needed--was reinforced during interviews with staff:

SS2: I used the example of a, a young man who had been self-harming quite prolifically, and in the course of one of the programmes started to

⁷ Any such notifications were made in accordance with the limited confidentiality to which participants had agreed.

disclose stuff about his life, he probably explained why he was self-harming. Um, and you know, when I was aware of that, I was concerned, but when I checked up, it was plain that actually it had been picked up exactly as I would want, in that the communication between the programme and staff... meant that there was immediate support for that prisoner. Um, and as I say, there's some support from other prisoners, but also we were picking him up, and you know, we've got, we've got good procedures for people who are at risk of self-harm and those worked exactly as I would have wished, so, um... It, it does mean that the partnership between the prison and the programme's important. If that programme had been going on in a room, with no staff present, or, a room with no staff present but actually people just turned up at the gate, did it, and left again, then we would have created a dangerous situation.

7: Discussion

In preparing this discussion section, we have been mindful of the length of this report overall and of the need to let participants speak for themselves. We have thus tried to keep our discussion to points that directly help the reader interpret the findings more easily and that relate directly to the hypothesis testing and concluding sections below.

7.1 Quantitative Findings

We open with consideration of the standardised scales. Significant differences were found between the two institutions on a number of psychological well being measures. However, none of these were long lasting and it seems unlikely that they are directly attributable to TFP. The differences between HMP Saturn and HMP&YOI Mercury were seen before and immediately after the programme but were not still present at time 3. Although some of the difference may have been due to attrition from the research process, the two significant findings obtained when controlling for the programme as well as institution also came through when we analysed the data taking a repeated measures approach (not reported here as the findings were effectively identical, but available if required). As repeated measures analyses are only conducted on all participants who remained throughout the process, and as they also highlighted the differences on Health and Anxiety, it would seem that these are worth consideration first.

As we highlighted in the welfare analyses, several participants in this research gave us concern with either their scores on the standardised scales or their state of mind during the qualitative research. In each case, they faced significant challenges, all pre-dated TFP and as far as we could tell, all were getting proper support from the prison. We believe that the main reason for the difference between the institutions is that the average age of the Mercury participants is so much younger than that at Saturn—a 16 year old, although he may have had significant life challenges, is by dint of years, less likely to have had as many problems as a 40 year old, or even a 25 year old. This still means that there are concerns for the implementation of TFP, not least because the “spike” in scores at time 2, may indicate that the programme is bringing concerns to the fore for prisoners. It may not cause the problems, but it could be bringing them into sharp relief. When properly handled, this may lead to positive change. Such change would be most likely when there is on-going, meaningful referral between TFP and the institutions in which it operates.

We do not have evidence that TFP workshops were harming prisoners, but we do have evidence of significant vulnerabilities in a few prisoners. This evidence ranges from scores on the PTSD scale classified as severe symptoms of Post Traumatic Stress, through to high scores on the GHQ that would indicate physical or psychological illness requiring proper diagnosis and treatment. The anxiety measures are also of concern in and of themselves and it is important to note the problems sub-scale of the CPIC at time 3. In each case, we would reiterate the point made above. Namely, that TFP consider the implications for implementation of their programme but we are satisfied that they were not caused by the programme itself. The last of those scales, the time 3 P (current life problems) sub-scale of the CPIC is the only measure where on first reading, one might consider the impact of the programme. However, it is clear that there was no difference between the research and control group on this measure, so could not be attributed to the intervention. Although the problems sub-scale did appear to be of concern at Time 3, we can see that this was caused by factors outside the prison; indeed, that is what the scale is essentially designed to measure. This was reinforced in qualitative interviews and so again, we would say that this is not something that TFP can control but is something worth ongoing consideration.

Where we do think that the programme was having an effect on standardised measures of relevance was on three other parts of the CPIC. The sub-scale variations between research and control group at time 3 are most encouraging and indicate that prisoners who had been through TFP were more likely to have better general attitudes towards offending (being less likely to condone it); are less likely to anticipate offending in the future (something reinforced within the qualitative component to the T3 interviews) and are less likely to evaluate crime as worthwhile. Crime Pics II is widely used within prisons and has been used to assess efficacy of the Enhanced Thinking Skills programme (e.g. Sadlier, 2010) and of the Sycamore Tree project (e.g. Feasey & Williams, 2009). In each of these examples, CPIC was used as a way to measure dynamic risk.

In each of those studies, victim hurt denial was also highlighted as an important variable to consider. In our evaluation, we did not find significant differences between the research and control group on the victim hurt denial sub-scale of the CPIC. However, it is important to note that the scores on the victim empathy sub-scale of the CPIC were very low in the first place. The lowest possible score would be 3 and the highest possible would be 15. That the mean scores are around about 5 indicates a statistical “floor” effect, where there simply isn’t room for much improvement on the scale, which would be particularly hard to pick up with such a low sample size. Given that prisons in general spend considerable energy working on victim empathy/awareness, this floor effect may be considered quite positive in general terms and reinforces the magnitude of the change on the other CPIC sub-scales which had both statistical significance, and power (the eta scores of around 20% when comparing research and control T3 data).

In contrast to this positive outcome on the impact of TFP, the standardised measures told us less about the process by which it is working and we now turn to the non-significant findings on the remaining attitudinal measures including Beck’s Dysfunctional Attitudes Scale and the Constructive Thinking Index. These highlight how difficult it is to test for or demonstrate mechanisms of change. We had included these measures along with the self competence and self liking measures to try to test whether any changes that may have been attributable to TFP, could have influenced the ways people approach problems, feel about themselves and cope with their lives. It is possible that the lack of significant difference is

due to the small sample size and lack of discriminatory power of the tools for such low numbers/amounts of variance. However, it is also possible that these mechanisms are simply not reflective of the way that TFP is working. As we will discuss below, we do believe that TFP is having an important impact, but it would seem fair to conclude that HOW it is having an impact, needs further consideration.

7. 2 Qualitative Findings

Although the standardised scales could not tell us much about how TFP seemed to be having an impact, the qualitative research component to this evaluation does allow us to say something about the process as well as to further our understanding of the impact assessments made above. Qualitative analysis provides not just a supplement to our quantitative findings, but a means of unpicking, and making sense of these results, by focusing in more depth on relevant aspects of the lived experiences of the prisoners and young offenders interviewed. This may provide us with a level of practical insight that goes beyond the quantitative scales, particularly given the floor effect on the victim hurt denial sub-scale. Close qualitative analysis allows us to examine much more precisely how prisoners demonstrate key psychosocial constructs such as empathy, in the details of their speech and in their reflections on changes to their self in relation to others.

The most encouraging finding is that there is almost unanimous praise for TFP's work and its impact, both from prisoners and from staff. They all highlight the powerful speakers, the sensitive facilitators and the importance of group and individual ownership of processes of change. TFP is time and again, identified as being different, as allowing prisoners and staff to step out of the normal roles required within incarceration. It fundamentally appears as a humanising, empowering intervention that provoked very strong support in evaluation participants. However, there is more to consider than this and we turn now to some of the potential areas of concern as well as of most success.

Prisoner well being was one of the main motivations for conducting this evaluation and the standardised scales seemed to indicate that although there were vulnerabilities, these were largely out of TFP's control. It is possible that TFP brought vulnerabilities to the fore. If this is the case, it could be argued that this would actually show the programme helping open up emotional avenues in the participants. However, it would also show the need to properly protect and support people in such journeys. Thus it is clear that the qualitative research offers a way to drill down a bit further into this area. For example, staff with direct experience of TFP and the prisoners themselves identified significant changes in attitudes and behaviours. These shifts were not easily attained, involving both group and individual consideration and insight that the offenders and prisoners indicated were far from usual for them. In some cases, it was clear that they had never paused to reflect on their lives before. There were instances of improved relationships with officers and calmer, more reasoned responses to challenges posed by the prison environment and other prisoners. There was also at least one instance where victimisation had been reported but not necessarily handled as well as it might have been and there were indications that prisoners did not know how or where to best express newly or rediscovered emotions and insights.

Without proper support, insight can turn to impotence and fear/vulnerability to anger. As the excerpts show, there were a few examples of prisoners crying themselves to sleep or giving indications of suicidal thoughts (such as wondering if they would be missed if

they died). These reinforce the importance of a compassionate implementation of justice and could pose a direct problem for management of a safe environment. These findings should also be considered in the ongoing support and management needs of prisoners engaging with TFP.

This highlights the need to set TFP within wider processes of imprisonment, rehabilitation, desistance and preparation for release. TFP was cited as being highly influential by adult prisoners/young offenders and by staff but it was not portrayed as some kind of universal, instant curative. The health, life problems and experiences of trauma that were evidenced, reinforce the socio demographic challenges faced by many prisoners, reinforced still further for those who indicated ongoing mental health and substance misuse challenges. Although prisoners had engaged with other programmes and were aiming for paid employment on release, they also acknowledged the difficulties they would be likely to face on trying to reintegrate themselves during resettlement. The “revolving door” of imprisonment is a real experience that these participants are aware of and seem to be working hard to avoid. Without long term follow up, post release, we cannot speak to TFP’s efficacy in this regard. However, this is something that could be done by OGRs analyses and, when there are sufficient numbers of prisoners who have been released, we would suggest that this be conducted.

As briefly touched on in section 1, processes of desistance are multi-faceted, influenced in multiple ways. The RSG/Maruna summary produced in 2010 highlights HM Prison Service’s emphasis on risk assessment and considers the importance of both RNR and GLM approaches. In considering our findings, we could argue that they also demonstrate the need to consider elements of each approach. For example, the quantitative and qualitative findings showing ongoing health, anxiety and substance misuse issues might be seen as elements indicating a prisoner in this sample is unlikely to be responsive to intervention and unable to change his behaviour. Meanwhile, the desire to be reunited with family, to be a suitable role model for children and live up to their mothers’ expectations could all be seen as making them more likely to be responsive. They are also areas where goals can be set to enable a move towards building strengths and resilience.

Relatedly, victim awareness is seen as being core to challenging offenders’ behaviours. Many programmes focus on elements of empathy and prisoners are very aware of the courts’ desire to see remorse shown for the harm done to victims. Therefore, the low scores in the victim hurt denial sub-scale of the CPIC could be seen as very positive indicators of prison helping rehabilitation. They could also be seen as prisoners responding to the demands made of them when seeking release under licence (and giving the answer they know is being sought). Thus it is important to note the very different language used in the qualitative interviews regarding victims. Indeed one prisoner explicitly differentiated between knowing what he was expected to say and do about victims for the courts, and really understanding victims’ experiences through TFP. If the move from lip service to genuine remorse is itself genuine (and not a manifestation of our evaluation), then this is a very hopeful finding. Given that so many prisoners identified the power of the speakers (naming a number of different ones) and the speakers’ impacts on the way they felt and thought about themselves and their victims, we think it likely that the participants have indeed opened their thoughts to consider victims as people like themselves.

Most of our findings are positive and most would seem to point towards increasing roll out of TFP. However, it is not an accredited programme and its implementation does

vary locally. We do not think that some local variations in implementation are insurmountable to accreditation, where they allow the different populations to be adequately considered alongside the other work going on in any one establishment. That said, we are ambivalent about the reasons/need for running TFP as an accredited programme. Staff and prisoners/offenders were themselves divided on what the likely impact would be of accrediting TFP, both in terms of how it would be viewed by prisoners and how its approach would be maintained, particularly if widespread roll out made it harder to train, supervise and support speakers or facilitators.

We note the staff participant who thought that it could never be “manualised” and think this worth further consideration. We agree that TFP would be very difficult to put into a check list based set of videos, for example. However, we do think that elements of the approach and process have already been articulated by TFP elsewhere and can be used to produce more formal systems of mentoring, support and training for people who implement the programme. If more systematic procedures can be introduced, then this might aid sustainability and potentially enhance capacity sufficiently to allow additional roll out, whether accredited or not. In terms of deciding whether to seek accreditation, we would suggest that TFP engage directly with the governors of institutions in which they currently operate who are also part of the Payment by Results pilot schemes as changes to commissioning in general, may move the decision away from accreditation and more towards how would targets be set and results assessed?

Lastly, we note that some of the prisoners were concerned that TFP was lost within the prison and not widely known about. Related to this is the repeated lack of understanding of what TFP does, before prisoners engaged in the workshop, even though the prospective participants had all attended information sessions. The need to raise the profile of the programme is not just for ongoing support, but to encourage initial participation. This might be enhanced by two changes that TFP have introduced whilst this evaluation has been undertaken. Firstly, the programme is now called *Restore* and the ambiguous connotations of forgiveness changed for another term (which is also somewhat ambiguous). The advantages that we see of *Restore*, include that the name sits well within criminal justice policy, can easily be explained in terms of restorative justice and harms done, and moves away from the forefront religious connotations of “forgiveness” without removing the possibility for restoration to be spiritual or religious. Indeed TFP changed the name on the realisation – as has been illustrated by some comments in this report – that too many prisoners assumed, and were resistant to the idea that TFP was a Chaplaincy (Christian) initiative and therefore neither relevant, nor of interest to them.

The second change is that within HMP&YOI Mercury, the programme is now being offered as a more mainstream part of education, similar to the approach taken at HMP Jupiter where it is routinely being offered after *Becoming Victim Aware*. This is something suggested by participants in our research and would seem sensible. As part of the assimilation into education, and due to a grant from the Home Office’s Communities against Guns, Gangs and Knife Crime fund (CAGGK), Forgiveness Project staff have trained prison staff in education and other departments at HMP&YOI Mercury so that TFP should now be more widely known about throughout the institution.

7.3 Limitations

The obvious limitation to this evaluation was always going to be the relatively low numbers of prisoners involved in the research and the lack of a female sample of prisoners. The all male prisoner participants reflects the predominance of both the male estate and where TFP was operating but if this research was to be replicated at a later date, or if recidivism work is to be undertaken, then a female sample should be sought. The low numbers also means that we need to be cautious in conclusions drawn. However, the use of a “test re-test” design and control group do mean that we can have some faith in the findings. Indeed, that there was still a significant effect on the CPIC sub-scales means that the programme’s impact needed to be quite large (as borne out by the size of the changes between the mean scores of research and control group at time 3 and by the change within research group from time 1 to time 3). This impact was also consistent with the qualitative interviews. We were not hearing much variation in the narratives about TFP from the participants, even though their own experiences aside from TFP were varied. We are confident that theoretical saturation (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) was reached and that the interviewees all saw TFP as positive, helpful and transformative.

The other main area of limitation is the lack of a direct measure of recidivism as participants were not followed up post release. Although CPIC is a robust proxy measure for recidivism, it is not the same as a proper, post release, statistical comparison against matched controls. The CPIC data and the qualitative interviews do show that behaviour within the establishments improved and custodial based changes should not, of themselves, be discounted. Yet, we do still hope that sufficient data will be available for this to be conducted at some point, possibly as part of consideration of whether TFP/*Restore* are part of Payment by Results (PbR) packages being put together.

The penultimate limitation we wish to consider relates to the nature of the control group we constructed. Although we believe that the control group was matched as well as possible to the research group, we would have also liked to have been able to have an additional comparison group made up from prisoners who started but did not complete the programme. Drop out during the period we investigated, was limited to one prisoner who did not want to participate in the research and we did not have the space/resources to try to construct a retrospective sample of non-completers. Ideally, the “clowns” referred to by a number of participants would be worth finding out more about in terms of how they perceive the programme and why they, and others dropped out.

Finally, we are aware that the interviews are very rich sources of data that could still be analysed in a number of different ways (for example, exploring the discourses and language used by prisoners with those of staff, or comparing uniformed and non-uniformed staff...). Such additional analyses may be something for future additional analyses, for example as part of a postgraduate dissertation, perhaps. Although such analyses would be interesting and potentially publishable from an academic perspective and potentially from a practice perspective, we do not believe that such analyses would be likely to change the overall conclusions in terms of the aims of this evaluation.

8: Conclusions and Recommendations

8.1 Hypothesis Testing and Conclusions

Our key hypotheses for this investigation are considered below:

H1 That TFP will encourage greater awareness of victims and victim empathy.

Based on the quantitative analyses, we would fail to reject the null hypothesis and have to conclude that TFP did not seem to encourage greater awareness of victims or victim empathy. However, as outlined above, we believe this to be a “floor effect” and that this floor effect may actually be considered quite positive in general terms. Further, one of the advantages of our mixed methodological approach, is that this is not where we need to stop in terms of testing this hypothesis. Comments made by the prisoners as part of the qualitative components to the interviews and by staff show that victims were being viewed differently as a result of TFP. As such, we can conclude partial support for this hypothesis.

H2 That TFP will encourage enhanced cognitive processing and improved thinking skills

From the quantitative data, we also have a mixed picture regarding this hypothesis. There are no statistically significant differences on the CTI or BDAS, but there is clearly a shift in offence related thinking that comes through from the CPIC sub-scales and the interviews. Also, the interviews clearly show a change in language, demeanour and outlook, all of which would feed into this area. Therefore, there is some limited support for concluding that TFP does encourage attitude change likely to have an impact on desistance from crime but we did not find evidence of enhanced cognitive processing or of improved thinking skills. Put another way, TFP has the potential to reduce reoffending--a positive impact-- but we are unsure of the processes by which such change occurs.

H3 That participants will face psycho-social challenges that result in additional needs, currently unmet.

These include: Increased anxiety; Challenges to self concept/self identity/self esteem and Increased negative attitudes.

In this case, we could reject the null hypothesis as some participants did clearly display anxiety, trauma, have health related problems and indicated difficulties coping with life problems. However, the data also indicate that these were either pre-existing before the TFP intervention or if concurrent, were largely to do with external factors. Our own experience of referring on prisoners and that of staff participants was that these needs were being met insofar as was possible within institutions. Our qualitative findings lead us to reiterate the importance of embedding TFP/*Restore* within regimes in ways that facilitate better understanding of their work and continue to allow prisoners’ vulnerabilities to be properly managed.

Overall, we would conclude that TFP is well received by prisoners and staff, potentially has an impact on recidivism and does well to stimulate insight and bring about change.

8.2 Recommendations

We end this report with some recommendations to increase capacity and sustainability:

Better Referral Routes and General Understanding of TFP

Although we do not believe that TFP was causing harm, we do think that the qualitative interviews demonstrated that prisoners were grappling with profoundly difficult personal insights and struggling to adapt their approaches. These processes would be easier for future cohorts if there was better understanding of TFP/*Restore* (the new name for TFP in prisons) within the “main” prison and if wing officers, particularly personal officers, know which prisoners are going through *Restore*, when, and the kinds of support that they may require in the short and medium term as a result of the intervention. We note the recent training provided to staff at HMP&YOI Mercury and hope that this approach will be sustained through routine communications and adopted elsewhere.

Consider adopting screening measures

We suggest that it would be useful to adopt some of the measures used here for screening at the start and end of each run of *Restore*. In particular, the Trauma screening tool, the CPIC and the GHQ would seem most helpful. The anxiety scale, although useful, may be too general a measure to allow for meaningful referral on whereas, if prisoners’ scores on the Trauma scale and on the GHQ are above thresholds of concern, then that could trigger systematic routine referrals between *Restore* and the rest of the prison. The advantage of taking before and after CPIC scores (hopefully some time after the intervention) is that it will enable a wider scale comparison using a recidivism proxy and allow TFP or NOMS to continue to monitor efficacy. It is important to note that we are not suggesting these be used for diagnoses, rather that they should be used to screen and possibly flag up prisoners with additional needs, so that they are known both to the facilitators and to the relevant prison teams.

The disadvantages of implementing the scales include that they take time to implement, and they may be seen as “psychologising” an intervention that is clearly highly regarded precisely because of its difference from other programmes. So, if these measures are to be used, we would suggest that they are implemented between the information session and starting on the programme. This could also be something to negotiate locally as something that the prisons themselves do as part of ongoing prisoner welfare and periodic, post initial induction assessment.

Long Term Follow Up

When enough people have completed TFP/*Restore* and been released, we would suggest that follow up assessment be conducted using an approach similar to that taken by Sadlier (2010), drawing on both Static and Dynamic indicators of risk. This would be facilitated by the implementation of pre and post screening measures mentioned above, used in conjunction with OGRs scores and the other measures adopted by Sadlier.

Consider Routes to wider Roll Out

Lastly, we believe that the trustees and executive officers of TFP should consider carefully whether they need to seek accreditation of *Restore* or whether they may be able to find ways to make its implementation more certain, without accreditation. We wonder whether

seeking to work as part of a consortium delivering services within a Social Impact Bond or other form of Payment by Results requires accreditation and whether that would be a more useful avenue to explore.

References:

- Adler, J. R; Burnside, J; Loucks, N and Viki, G. T. (2008) Measuring Religion in Prisons: Offenders' Beliefs and Attitudes *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, 8(2) 130 – 149.
- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2006). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (4th ed.). Newark, NJ: LexisNexis/Matthew Bender.
- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). Rehabilitating criminal justice policy and practice. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, 16, 39-55.
- Beck, A. T., Brown, G., Steer, R. A., and Weissman, A. (1991). Factor Analysis of the Dysfunctional Attitudes Scale in a clinical population. *Psychological Assessment*, 3, 478–483.
- Birgden, A. (2004). Therapeutic Jurisprudence and Responsivity: Finding the will and the way in offender rehabilitation *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 10(3), pp. 283-295.
- Burnett, R. (2010). Post-Corrections Reintegration: Prisoner Resettlement And Desistance From Crime. In J. R. Adler & J. M. Gray (Eds.) *Forensic Psychology: Concepts, debates and practice*. (2nd ed.). Cullompton: Willan.
- Epstein, S., and Meier, P. (1989). Constructive Thinking: A broad coping variable with specific components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 332-350.
- Feasey, S. and Williams, P. (2009). An evaluation of the Sycamore Tree Programme: based on an analysis of Crime Pics II
Data <http://www.prisonfellowship.org.uk/assets/files/Sycamore%20Tree%20Final%20Report.pdf> (accessed September, 2011)
- Foa, E. B. (1995). The Posttraumatic Diagnostic Scale (PDS) manual. Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems.
- Frude, N., Honess, T., and Maguire, M. (1998). *Crime Pics II Manual* (2nd ed.) Cardiff: Michael and Associates.
- Hudson, J. and Galaway, B. (1996) Elements of a Restorative Justice Approach. In B. Galaway and J. Hudson. *Restorative Justice: International perspectives*. Amsterdam: Kugler Publications.
- Glaser, B. G. and Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Goldberg, D. P. and Hillier, V. F. (1979). A scaled version of the General Health Questionnaire. *Psychological Medicine*, 9, pp 139-145 doi:10.1017/S0033291700021644.
- Goldberg, D., and Williams, P. (1988). A user's guide to the General Health Questionnaire. Windsor, UK: NFER-Nelson
- Lipton, D.S., Martinson, R. and Wilks, J. (1975) *The effectiveness of correctional treatment: A survey of treatment valuation studies*. New York, NY: Praeger Press.

- Lösel, F. (2010) What Works in Reducing Reoffending: A Global Perspective. *First European Seminar of the STARR Project*, 27th April 2010, Cambridge.
- Lösel, F. and Schmucker, M. (2005) The effectiveness of treatment for sexual offenders: A comprehensive meta-analysis. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1, 117-146.
- Loucks, N. (1998) *HMPI Cornton Vale: Research into Drugs and Alcohol, Violence and Bullying, Suicides and Self-Injury, and Backgrounds of Abuse*. Occasional Paper 1/98. Edinburgh: Scottish Prison Service.
- Martinson, R. (1974) What works? - Questions and answers about prison reform. *The Public Interest*, 35,22-54.
- Maruna, S. (2001) *Making Good: How Ex-convicts Reform and Rebuild their Lives*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- MoJ (2012) *The Correctional Services Accreditation Panel Annual Report 2010-2011*
<http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/publications/corporate-reports/MoJ/correctional-services-acc-panel-annual-report-2010-11.pdf> (accessed 16.8.12)
- Moffitt, T. E. (2003). Life Course Persistent and Adolescence-limited antisocial behaviour: A research review and a research agenda. In B. Lahey, T. E. Moffitt and A. Caspi (Eds.) *The Causes of Conduct Disorder and Serious Juvenile Delinquency*. New York: Guilford.
- Porporino, F. J. (2010) Bringing sense and sensitivity to corrections: From programmes to 'fix' offenders to services to support desistance. In J. Brayford, F. Cowe and J. Deering (Eds.) *What Else Works? Creative work with offenders*. Cullompton: Willan.
- Rehabilitation Services Group/ Maruna, S. (2010). *Understanding Desistance from Crime*. London: Ministry of Justice.
- Sadler, G. (2010). Evaluation of the impact of the HM Prison Service Enhanced Thinking Skills programme on reoffending: Outcomes of the Surveying Prisoner Crime Reduction (SPCR) sample. *Ministry of Justice Research Series 19/10*.
<http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/publications/research-and-analysis/moj-research/eval-enhanced-thinking-skills-prog.pdf> (accessed, 29th March, 2012)
- Smith, J. A., Flowers, P., and Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, Method and Research*. London: Sage.
- Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., and Lushene, R. E. (1970). *The Anxiety Inventory*. Palo Alto: Psychologists Press.
- Tafarodi, R. W., & Swann, W. B. Jr. (2001). Two-dimensional self-esteem: theory and measurement. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31, 653-673.
- Ward, T. and Maruna, S. (2007) *Rehabilitation: Beyond the Risk Paradigm*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Wexler, D. B. (1999) *Therapeutic Jurisprudence: An Overview*
<http://www.law.arizona.edu/depts/upr-intj/intj-o.html> (Accessed, 23rd February, 2012)

Appendix 1 – Qualitative Interview Schedules

Interview schedule - Prospective research group participants at Time 3

It is accepted that the way in which people cope with difficult situations can change over time. As part of this research, we are interested in exploring, from your point of view, the process of this change and the potential roles played by The Forgiveness Project.

1. How did you come to The Forgiveness Project programme?
2. How did you find it/what was it like?
 - Prompt for speakers, other prisoners, maybe cell diary?
3. Do you feel that you have taken anything away from the programme, for examples, any ideas that were new to you?
 - Prompt for within custody and beyond.
4. Have you completed any other programmes during the past 3 months?
5. In the last 3 months, would you say that you have coped with difficult situations more or less effectively than before?
 - Prompt to unpick differences before current sentence and possible differences since TFP.
 - Prompt to unpick coping strategies and whether they vary from before.
 - If changes mentioned, prompt to try to understand motivations or causes of change.
6. As part of this project, we're interested in hearing about possible motivations to change. We'd be very interested to hear about whether you feel that your motivations have shifted at all in recent months?
(internal, e.g. self driven)
(external: prisons based, e.g. to progress through the system)
(external: non prisons based, e.g. familial)
7. We're also interested in your hopes and motivations, how you intend to achieve them and whether they have changed.
 - Prompts may be necessary to unpick the different parts here but the ideas are related so probably work best together.
 - How do you want to move on from this sentence?
8. Are you generally happy with how you get on with other people?
 - Prompts for inside and outside, challenging situations may be necessary.
9. Do you think it likely that you'll end up back inside prison?
10. Do you think you've changed?
 - Who, or what has brought about these changes?
11. Is there anything that you want to add to what you've said thus far?
12. Do you have any questions for me?

Thank you for taking part in this research (see debriefing notes to follow).

Interview schedule – Retrospective research participants

It is accepted that the way in which people cope with difficult situations can change over time. As part of this research, we are interested in exploring, from your point of view, the process of this change and the potential roles played by The Forgiveness Project.

1. Thinking back, how did you initially come to The Forgiveness Project programme?
2. Overall, what did you think about it when you first completed it?
 - a. Prompt for speakers, other prisoners, maybe cell diary?
3. What do think about it now?
4. Do you feel that you have taken anything away from the programme, for example, any ideas that were new to you?
 - a. Prompt for within custody and beyond.
5. Have you completed any other programmes since you completed TFP?
(How was/were it/they?)
(How did it/ have they compare (d) to The Forgiveness Project?)
6. Please comment on any changes you have noticed in the manner in which you handle difficult situations since coming to this prison.
 - a. Prompt to unpick differences before current sentence and possible differences since TFP.
 - b. Prompt to unpick coping strategies and whether they vary from before.
 - c. If changes mentioned, prompt to try to understand motivations or causes of change.
7. As part of this project, we're interested in hearing about possible motivations to change. We'd be very interested to hear about whether you feel that your motivations have shifted at all in recent months?
(internal, e.g. self driven)
(external: prisons based, e.g. to progress through the system)
(external: non prisons based, e.g. familial)
8. We're also interested in your hopes and motivations, how you intend to achieve them and whether they have changed.
 - a. Prompts may be necessary to unpick the different parts here but the ideas are related so probably work best together.
 - b. How do you want to move on from this sentence?
9. Are you generally happy with how you get on with other people?
 - a. Prompts for inside and outside, challenging situations may be necessary.
10. Do you think it likely that you'll end up back inside prison?
11. Do you think you've changed?
 - a. Who, or what has brought about these changes?
12. Is there anything that you want to add to what you've said thus far?
13. Do you have any questions for me?

Thank you for taking part in this research (see debriefing notes to follow).

Interview schedule - Members of staff at T3

1. Are you involved at all in The Forgiveness Project Workshops?
If yes, prompt for more information on role, involvement etc.
If no, double check that they know what it is. If no knowledge of the programme or of prisoners who have been through the workshops, then abort interview.
If they do know about it, but are not directly involved, then please continue.
2. What do you think Prisoners/Young Offenders get from TFP workshops?
3. Are there any particular strengths of TFP workshops or things that you think the offenders do better as a result of being through the workshops?
Prompt in relation to victim empathy, openness to change, etc.
4. Do you think that there are any particular problems raised by TFP workshops?
Prompt in relation to health issues and vulnerabilities.
5. Can you think of any prisoners who have done particularly well as a result of TFP?
6. Can you think of any prisoners who seem to have done particularly badly as a result of TFP?
7. Overall what do you feel about TFP in prisons?
8. Do you think that TFP have had any impact upon this Prison's regime more widely?
9. Would you recommend TFP workshops to prisoners?
Prompt to assess whether this applies to all prisoners/young offenders.
10. Would you recommend TFP to other staff?

Thank you for taking part in this research.

Appendix 2 – Information Sheets, Consent and Debrief Forms

Information sheet (prospective research, prospective control, and retrospective, prisoner/offender participants)

(Three versions of the sheet below were prepared for the three prisoner/young offender participant groups indicated. The only change was to the section ‘What will happen to me if I take part in this research?’ and the alternative versions of this section are given below.)

The Forgiveness Project Evaluation:

Principal Investigator: Dr Joanna R. Adler; Department of Psychology, Middlesex University, The Burroughs, Hendon, London, NW4 4BT www.mdx.ac.uk/fps 020 8411 4502

The Forgiveness Project Evaluation: Information Sheet for Participants

You are being invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide to participate, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take your time to read the following information carefully, and discuss it with others if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take your time to decide whether or not you wish to take part.

Participation in this research is entirely voluntary. You do not have to take part if you do not want to. If you do decide to take part, then you may withdraw at any time, and you do not need to give a reason for you are leaving the research.

What is the purpose of this research?

The research is being conducted to assess the effectiveness of The Forgiveness Project, a programme run within this prison. We are asking people to take part in the research if they are about to complete the programme or if they have already completed it. In addition, we are inviting some people to take part who have not completed the Forgiveness Project but who will have a good idea of life in general in this prison.

What will happen to me if I take part in this research?

V1 Prospective: Research Participants: If you agree to participate in this research, then you will be invited to a series of 3 interviews, one before you complete the Forgiveness Project’s programme (around now), one, about a week after the programme has finished and one about 3 months later. The first two interviews will take about half an hour and the third one will take a little longer, between half an hour and an hour. Each of them involve a series of questionnaires and the last interview includes a more in depth discussion about programmes and interventions.

V2 Prospective: Control Participants: If you agree to participate in this research, then you will be invited to 2 interviews, one around now and one in about 3 months time. The first interview will take about half an hour and the second one will take a little longer, between half an hour and an hour. Each of them involves a series of questionnaires; the second interview also includes a more in depth discussion about programmes and interventions.

V3 Retrospective Participants: If you agree to participate in this research, then you will be invited to an interview, around about now. This will involve an in depth discussion about programmes and interventions.

What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?

There are no obvious risks to taking part in this research. However, we should emphasise that your confidentiality is limited by security concerns. If you indicate something which is a threat to your own security or that of others within the prison, then we will have to breach your confidentiality. In all other circumstances, your confidentiality is assured.

Consent

You will be given a copy of this information sheet to take away with you and you will be asked to sign a consent form before taking part in the research.

Who is organising and funding the research?

This research is being conducted by Forensic Psychological Services for The Forgiveness Project. It is funded by the Bromley Trust and the Raine Foundation.

What will happen to the information I provide?

The information and data we collect as part of this evaluation may be used for analysis and subsequent publication. No individuals will be identified within reports of this evaluation.

Who has reviewed the study?

All proposals for research using human participants are reviewed by an Ethics Committee before they can proceed. The Middlesex Psychology Department's Ethics Committee have reviewed this proposal. It has also been reviewed by the joint Research Ethics Committees for Health, Social Care and the Ministry of Justice.

Thank you for taking the time to read through this form. If you have any further questions, please ask them now.

Overleaf, please find an example of the Staff information sheet. This was personalised for each prison to mention the relevant staff to contact to take part in the interview.

The Forgiveness Project Evaluation - Information Sheet for Participants

Principal Investigator: Dr Joanna R. Adler
Department of Psychology, Middlesex University, The Burroughs, Hendon, London, NW4 4BT
020 8411 4502, www.mdx.ac.uk/fps

You are being invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide to participate, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take your time to read the following information carefully, and discuss it with others if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take your time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Participation in this research is entirely voluntary. You do not have to take part if you do not want to. If you do decide to take part, then you may withdraw at any time, and you do not need to give a reason for you are leaving the research.

What is the purpose of this research?

The research is being conducted to assess the effectiveness of The Forgiveness Project, a programme run within this prison. We are speaking to offenders at three different sites who have completed the programme. In addition, we are now inviting some members of staff to take part who have knowledge of the programme or who come into close contact with offenders who have participated.

What will happen to me if I take part in this research?

If you agree to participate in this research, then you will be invited to an interview within the next few weeks. This will involve an in depth discussion about whether offender who have completed the programme have shown progress, or needed any form of additional support. We are also interested in how the programme has generally been received at this institution. The interview will last between half an hour and an hour. An effort will be made to fit the interview in around your existing commitments.

What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?

There are no obvious risks to taking part in this research. Your confidentiality is assured, except in cases where you may indicate something that represents a threat to individuals within the prison, or the establishment as a whole.

Consent

You will be given a copy of this information sheet to take away with you and you will be asked to sign a consent form before taking part in the research.

Who is organising and funding the research?

This research is being conducted by Forensic Psychological Services for The Forgiveness Project. It is funded by the Bromley Trust and the Raine Foundation.

What will happen to the information I provide?

The information and data we collect as part of this evaluation may be used for analysis and subsequent publication. No individuals will be identified within reports of this evaluation.

Who has reviewed the study?

All proposals for research using human participants are reviewed by an Ethics Committee before they can proceed. The Middlesex Psychology Department's Ethics Committee have reviewed this proposal. It has also been reviewed by the joint Research Ethics Committees for Health, Social Care and the Ministry of Justice.

Thank you for taking the time to read through this form. If you are interested in participating please speak to a member of staff in who will be able to arrange a specific date for the interview. If you have any further questions about the research please feel free to contact the research team directly.

Consent Form

(Same version used with all participants across all sites)

The Forgiveness Project Evaluation:

Principal Investigator: Dr Joanna R. Adler; Department of Psychology, Middlesex

University, The Burroughs, Hendon, London, NW4 4BT

www.mdx.ac.uk/fps

020 8411 4502

Middlesex University School of Health and Social Sciences

Psychology Department

Written Informed Consent

Evaluation of The Forgiveness Project. 2010-2011

Dr Joanna R Adler and Mansoor Mir

I have understood the details of the research as explained to me by the researcher, and confirm that I have consented to act as a participant.

I have been given contact details for the researcher in the information sheet.

I understand that my participation is entirely voluntary, that the data collected during the research will not be identifiable, and that I have the right to withdraw from the project at any time without having to explain why.

I further understand that the information I provide may be used for analysis and subsequent publication, and provide my consent for this to happen.

Print name

Sign Name

date: _____

To the participants: Data may be inspected by the Chair of the Psychology Ethics panel and the Chair of the School of Social Sciences Ethics committee of Middlesex University, if required by institutional audits about the correctness of procedures. Although this would happen in strict confidentiality, please tick here if you do not wish your data to be included in audits: _____

The Forgiveness Project Evaluation:

Principal Investigator: Dr Joanna R. Adler; Department of Psychology, Middlesex University, The Burroughs, Hendon, London, NW4 4BT
www.mdx.ac.uk/fps 020 8411 4502

DEBRIEFING SHEET

Evaluation of The Forgiveness Project. 2010-2011

Prospective: Thank you for taking part in this research today. This was the first/second/last interview. (If not last interview, then: I'll look forward to seeing you again in about a month/three months).

Retrospective: Thank you for taking part in this research today.

When all the interviews are complete, we will analyse them using a mixture of research techniques. We will write up a report for The Forgiveness Project and a report for everyone who has taken part in the research. We hope to have these reports with you within 6 months.

Do you have any additional questions for me about the research process or what will happen to this information?

If you have any questions about this research or the findings, then do please get in touch with us using the details at the top of this sheet. Also, if for some reason, you do not get your copy of the report, do please let us know.

Forensic Psychological Services

Middlesex University School of Health and Education
The Burroughs Hendon London NW4 4BT

Tel: 020 8411 4502

Web: www.mdx.ac.uk/fps

Email: fps@mdx.ac.uk



Consultancy



Expertise



**Middlesex
University
London**